BRILL'S COMPANIONS TO THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

A COMPANION TO BONAVENTURE

Edited by

JAY M. HAMMOND, J.A. WAYNE HELLMANN & JARED GOFF

BRILL

A Companion to Bonaventure

Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition

A series of handbooks and reference works on the intellectual and religious life of Europe, 500–1800

Editor-in-Chief
Christopher M. Bellitto
(Kean University)

VOLUME 48

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bcct

A Companion to Bonaventure

Edited by

Jay M. Hammond
J.A. Wayne Hellmann
Jared Goff

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Cover illustration: St Bonaventure by Vittore Crivelli, 1502 (upper half of panel). Courtesy Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, item SK-A-3391.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to Bonaventure / edited by Jay M. Hammond, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, Jared Goff.
pages cm. — (Brill's companions to the Christian tradition ; 48)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-26072-6 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-26073-3 (e-book : alk. paper)
1. Bonaventure, Saint, Cardinal, approximately 1217–1274. I. Hammond, Jay M., Ph. D. II. Hellmann, J.A. Wayne.

B765.B74C66 2013
230'.2092—dc23

2013032763

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1871-6377
ISBN 978-90-04-26072-6 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-26073-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Notes on Contributors vii
Abbreviations ix

Introduction 1
Jay M. Hammond and J.A. Wayne Hellmann

FOUNDATIONS

Bonaventure: Life and Works 9
Marianne Schlosser

The Opera Omnia of Saint Bonaventure: History and Present Situation 61
Pietro Maranesi

Bonaventure's Theological Method 81
Gregory LaNave

Bonaventure's Philosophical Method 121
Christopher M. Cullen

THEOLOGY

Bonaventure as Exegete 167
Jacques Guy Bougerol

Bonaventure's Trinitarian Theology 189
Zachary Hayes

The Christology of the *Breviloquium* 247
Joshua Benson

Bonaventure's Angelology 289
David Keck

Bonaventure: On the Institution of Sacraments 333
J.A. Wayne Hellmann

SPIRITUALITY AND PRACTICE

Theology, Spirituality and Christ the Center:
Bonaventure's Synthesis 361
Ilia Delio

Bonaventure as Preacher 403
Timothy J. Johnson

The *Legenda Minor* 435
Timothy J. Johnson

Bonaventure's *Legenda Major* 453
Jay M. Hammond

Bonaventure's Defense of Mendicancy 509
Kevin L. Hughes

Bonaventure as Minister General 543
Dominic V. Monti

Index 579

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Joshua Benson is Assistant Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology at the Catholic University of America. His research and publications concern the writings of Bonaventure and other Franciscan theologians of the thirteenth century.

Jacques Guy Bougerol was a French Franciscan scholar and eminent Franciscan authority regarded as one of the leading interpreters of St. Bonaventure's thought. He helped edit the massive five volume work, *S. Bonaventura, 1274–1974*. His book, *Introduction to the Works of St. Bonaventure* remains a mainstay in Bonaventurian studies.

Christopher M. Cullen is Associate Professor of philosophy at Fordham University. His publications include *Bonaventure* as well as work on Bonaventure's principal mentor, Alexander of Hales, and on his important disciple, John Peckham.

Ilia Delio is Director and Professor of Catholic Studies at Georgetown University. Her recent publications include *Compassion: Living in the Spirit of St. Francis*, *The Emergent Christ*, and *The Unbearable Wholeness of Being: God, Evolution, and the Power of Love.*

Jared Goff is an instructor at Mount Angel Seminary and Holy Apostles College and Seminary. His research interests include the theology and philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and John Duns Scotus.

Jay M. Hammond is Associate Professor of Historical Theology at Saint Louis University. His publications include, co-editor and contributor for *Studies on the Franciscan Sources*, vols. 1–3. His research focuses of the writings of Francis of Assisi, Bonaventure, and the mural decoration of the Basilica of San Francesco in Assisi.

Zachary Hayes is a retired faculty member at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago. He is a noted Bonaventure scholar, regarded as one of the leading interpreters of St. Bonaventure's thought. He is the author of many books and articles on Bonaventure, notably, *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure*.

J.A. Wayne Hellmann is Professor of Historical Theology at Saint Louis University. Most recently, he served a co-editor for *Studies on the Franciscan Sources*, vols. 1–3. He is currently translating selections of Bonaventure *Sentence Commentary* on the sacraments. He serves as co-editor for *Franciscan Studies*.

Kevin L. Hughes is Associate Professor of Theology and Religious Studies and Chair of the Humanities Department and Classical Studies Program at Villanova University. His research specialties and journal publications are in Ancient and Medieval Christian theology, spirituality.

Timothy J. Johnson is Professor of Religion and Chair if the Humanities Department at Flagler College. He is author of *The Soul in Ascent: Bonaventure on Poverty, Prayer, and Union with God* and various journal articles on Franciscan spirituality and theology. He edited *Franciscans Preaching* and *Franciscans at Prayer* in *The Medieval Franciscans* series by Brill.

David Keck received his PhD from Harvard and is a lecturer at Duke University. His recent publications include *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages* (Oxford).

Gregory LaNave is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at the Dominican House of Studies in Washington D.C. His research and journal publications concern Bonaventure's theology and philosophy.

Pietro Maranesi works as Prof. of Franciscan Theology in Assisi and Rome. He is a prolific Franciscan author whose most recent books include Verbum inspiratum: Chiave ermeneutica dell'Hexaemeron di San Bonaventura; L'eredità di frate Francesco: Lettura storico-critica del Testamento; Francesco d'Assisi e i frati minori: nascita ed espansione di un'esperienza religiosa; and La clausura di Chiara d'Assisi: un valore o una necessità?

Dominic V. Monti is provincial vicar for the Holy Name Province. His research focuses on Franciscan history and theology. His recent publications include a new edition of the *Breviloquium* in the Works of St. Bonaventure series.

Marianne Schlosser is Professor of theology and spirituality at the University of Vienna. Her research focuses on the theology and spirituality of the patristic and the High Middle Ages, particularly the mendicant orders. Her recent publications include *Bonaventura: Baum des Lebens. Geistliche Betrachtungen* and *Bonaventura: Der Pilgerweg des Menschen zu Gott.*

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for Bonaventure's Works

I, II, III, IV Sent.	*Commentarius in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*
Apol. Paup.	*Apologia pauperum*
Brev.	*Breviloquium*
Chr. mag.	*Sermo Christus unus omnium magister*
Coll. Jn.	*Collationes in Evangelium Ioannis*
Comm. Ecc.	*Commentarius in librum Ecclesiastes*
Comm. Jn.	*Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis*
Comm. Luc.	*Commentarius in Evangelium Lucae*
Comm. Sap.	*Commentarius in librum Sapientiae*
Const. Narb.	*Constitutiones Generales Narbonenses*
Corp. Chr.	*Sermo de sanctissimo corpore Christi*
De dec. praec.	*Collationes de decem praeceptis*
De don. Spir.	*Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti*
De quin. fest.	*De quinque festivitatibus pueri Jesu*
De reg. anim.	*De regimine animae*
De test. Trin.	*Sermo de triplici testimonio sanctissimae Trinitatis*
Epist.	*Epistola*
Frat. min.	*Quare Fratres Minores praedicent et confessiones audiant*
Imit. Chr.	*Epistola de imitatione Christi*
Itin.	*Itinerarium mentis in Deum*
Hex.	*Collationes in Hexaemeron*
Leg. maj.	*Legenda major sancti Francisci*
Leg. min.	*Legenda minor sancti Francisci*
Lig. vit.	*Lignum vitae*
Myst. Trin.	*Quaestio disputata de mysterio Trinitatis*
Pass. Dom.	*Officium de passione Domini*
Perf. evang.	*Quaestio disputata de perfectione evangelica*
Perf. vit. sor.	*De perfectione vitae ad sorores*
Plant. parad.	*Tractatus de plantatione paradisi*
Praep. miss.	*Tractatus de praeparatione ad missam*
Quin. mem.	*Epistola continens viginti quinque memorialia*
Red. art.	*De reductione artium ad theologiam*
Reg. Dei	*Sermo de regno Dei descripto in parabolis evangelicis*

Reg. Frat. min.	*Sermo super regulam fratrum minorum*
Reg. nov.	*Regula novitiorum*
Sand. apos.	*Epistola de sandaliis apostolorum*
Scien. Chr.	*Quaestio disputata de scientia Christi*
Serm.	*Sermones*
Sex Ser.	*De sex alis Seraphim*
Solil.	*Soliloquium de quatuor mentalibus exercitiis*
Tri. quaes. mag.	*Epistola de tribus quaestionibus ad magistrum innominatum*
Trip. via	*De triplici via*
Vitis myst.	*Vitis mystica sive Tractus de passione Domini*

Abbreviations for Distinctions in Individual Texts

a.	articulus
ad op.	ad oppositum
an.	annotatio
arg.	argumentum
au.	articulus unicus
c.	capitulum
col.	collatio
con.	contra
concl.	conclusio
d.	distinctio
dub.	dubium
fr.	fructus
fa.	fundamenta
fm.	fundamentum
n.	numerus
opp.	oppositum
p.	pars
praenot.	praenotata
prol.	prologus
prooem.	prooemium
q.	quaestio
resp.	respondeo
rub.	rubrica
s.c.	sed contra
sol.	solutio
un.	unicus

INTRODUCTION

Jay M. Hammond and J.A. Wayne Hellmann

> *That you may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length, height and depth.*
> (Ephesians 3:18; Brev. prol. 1)

This volume, *Companion to Bonaventure*, offers a collection of essays that, in part, represent newer scholars who continue to discover Bonaventure's theological, philosophical, mystical and pastoral insights. This volume is also the first collection of essays on his thought to be published in the twenty-first century. It emerges from and is built upon seminal studies of the previous century.

As the first collection of essays on Bonaventure's thought in the twenty-first century, it is appropriate to remember highlights of Bonaventure studies from the previous century. The foundation for the modern study of St. Bonaventure was the publication of the *Opera Omnia: Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae opera omnia* 10 vols. (Quaracchi: 1882–1902). The completion of this publication opened the door for the twentieth century scholarship. Among the first to walk through this door was Romano Guardini (1885–1968). His doctoral dissertation, completed in 1915 at the University of Freiburg, utilized the Quaracchi edition to present Bonaventure's theology of salvation: *Die Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura von der Erlösung*, later published in 1921 (Düsseldorf). In this study, Guardini maintains that, unlike other scholastics, Bonaventure understood salvation as a great mystery, implying rich diversity and multidimensionality (*Mannigfaltigkeit*). In other words, Guardini argued that other medieval explanations risked reducing satisfaction to a single dimension at the expense of the manifold mystery of the Incarnation. This doctoral dissertation fostered Guardini's further interest in the manner in which Bonaventure brings together multiple concepts, images, symbols, and theories in the building of his theology. Thus, seven years later he completed his *Habilitationschrift* at the University of Bonn in 1922, once again on the thought of St. Bonaventure. This was published in 1964 by Werner Dettloff, *Systembildende Elemente in der Theologie Bonaventuras* (Leiden: Brill). In this work, Guardini specifically pursues the connection of disparate ideas (*Ideenkomplex*) that built Bonaventure's multidimensional system of doing theology.

Although Guardini did not live to experience the seventh centenary of St. Bonaventure's death in 1974, his insights were confirmed in the multidimensionality of the international academic celebration that took place. The 1976 publication, *San Bonaventura Maestro di Vita Francescana e di Sapienza Cristiana*, by Alfonso Pompei of the acts of the international congress held in Rome (19–26 September 1974), offers a collection of the approximately one hundred and thirty papers delivered at the congress. These papers, taken together, further reveal the variety, breath, depth, and complexity of Bonaventure's thought.

A second commemorative publication for the seventh centenary, published 1972–1974, was the five-volume *S. Bonaventura, 1274–1974*, by Jacques Guy Bougerol (Assisi: *Volumen Commemorativum Anni Septies Centenarii a Morte S. Bonaventurae Doctoris Seraphici*). These five volumes contain nearly one hundred essays. Additionally, the first volume in this series is dedicated to a study and collection of iconography representing Bonaventure throughout the centuries. The fifth volume offers an extensive bibliography (1850–1973), complied by Jacques Guy Bougerol. These two commemorative publications were a monumental milestone in the history of Bonaventure studies.

Of course, there were many other seminal and important publications in the course of the twentieth century. There is the foundational work of Jacques Guy Bougerol, especially his *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: 1961 and 1988; English trans. *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 1964). A host of other scholars made important contributions also. To name a few: Ignatius Brady, Camil Bérubé, Efrem Bettoni, Jean-Marie Bissen, Guilio Bonafede, Jean François Bonnefoy, Theodore Crowley, Ewert Cousins, Balduinus Distelbrink, Olegario González, Etienne Gilson, Jacqueline Hamesse, Zachary Hayes, Bernard McGinn, Anton Pegis, Walter Principe, Michael Schmaus, Albert Stohr, Georges Tavard, Orlando Todisco, Joseph Ratzinger, John Francis Quinn, Leon Veuthey, and Titus Szabó. The Franciscan Institute Publications at St Bonaventure University, in Olean, NY likewise began the publication of translations. This continues to the present day in the *Bonaventure Texts in Translation* project, edited by Robert Karris OFM, with a view to publishing in English the entire corpus of Bonaventure's *Opera Omnia*.

It is now nearly forty years since the collected essays of the seventh centenary. It is not the intention of this volume to compete with or replace the earlier studies. Rather, the editors hope this collection will point the way forward and encourage an even newer generation of scholars. As the eighth centenary of Bonaventure's birth in 2017 approaches,

may this collection of essays lay a foundation for future scholars to match, and even to surpass, in 2074 what was done in 1974. This *Companion to Bonaventure* volume builds upon the scholarship in the 1974 volumes. The reader of this new collection of essays will notice how the study begun by Romano Guardini continues with sensitivity to the multidimensionality of Bonaventure's approach in understanding and articulating the Western Christian theological tradition. *Mannigfaltigkeit* is alive and well.

To assist the readers, the editors have divided the collection of fifteen essays into three sections: (1) Foundations, (2) Theology, (3) Spirituality and Practice. In the first section, Foundations, Marianne Schlosser first offers an overview of the life and works of St Bonaventure. She describes well Bonaventure's course of study, distinguishes clearly between the two mendicant controversies, and offers an overview of the diverse genres of Bonaventure's writings. Pietro Maranesi narrates the publication history of Bonaventure's writings and critically assesses the status of the Quaracchi edition of the *Opera Omnia.* Then, two essays follow on Bonaventure's methodology, theological and philosophical, the former by Gregory LeNave and the latter by Christopher Cullen. They introduce the reader to the current discussion of the interrelatedness of his theological and philosophical methodology.

In the second section, Theology, the first two essays, although edited and updated by Jared Goff, were initially written by scholars of the twentieth century, Jacques Guy Bougerol and Zachery Hayes. It was judged that no single article or essay in current scholarship has surpassed their work on Bonaventure's theology of the Scriptures and of the Trinity. The second two essays are by newer scholars. The first of these, by Joshua Benson, approaches Bonaventure's Christology with a focus on contextualizing his theology of Christ within the structure of the *Breviloquium*. This assists the reader to discover Bonaventure's Christology on every page of this theological masterpiece. David Keck moves into new territory with his essay on Bonaventure's angelology. He demonstrates the significance of angels for Bonaventure's overall theology and even for Bonaventure's approach to the mendicant controversies. Finally, in the fifth theological essay, Wayne Hellmann demonstrates Bonaventure's broad notion, rooted in the earlier tradition, of the "institution" of sacraments. Bonaventure offers a richness that was lost in the wake of the polemics of the sixteenth century.

In the third section, Spirituality and Practice, the first essay, by Ilia Delio, develops Bonaventure's understanding of the relationship between spiritual development and theological insight. In the development of this

relationship, St Francis of Assisi plays a central role. She pursues this topic in view of today's ever increasing appreciation of spirituality as a theological discipline. The second essay by Timothy Johnson reviews the context of thirteenth-century preaching and offers insight into Bonaventure's theology of preaching and its vital role in the life of the Minorites. He draws on Bonaventure's university sermons and on his more than three hundred and eighty extant pastoral sermons.

Attention then turns to the *Legenda minor* in an essay, again by Timothy Johnson, and then to the *Legenda major* in an essay by Jay Hammond. In the first, Johnson explores the text as a new liturgical reading of the performative memory of the founder as suited to the then realities of the Minorite Order. In the second, Hammond provides a contextual analysis of Bonaventure's hagiography by exploring how the *Legenda major* reads as a performative text that guides the reader to imitate Francis according to the triple way of purgation, illumination, and perfection. Thirdly, Kevin Hughes opens new approaches toward understanding Bonaventure's response to the mendicant controversies. Bonaventure's responses are not just responses to external accusations. Rather, these responses reveal Bonaventure's theological vision itself, his understanding of Christ and of the Church. Finally, in the last essay, Dominic Monti summarizes his recent research on Bonaventure's seventeen years as general minister. He argues that Bonaventure cannot be identified as "the second founder" of the Minorite Order. Instead, Bonaventure, with his brilliant mind, is the "great synthesizer" of developments that had been underway since the clerical coup of 1239, which deposed Brother Elias, some years before Bonaventure joined the Order.

Unfortunately, we were unable to include two important essays. The volume lacks an essay on Bonaventure's theological anthropology and Mariology. His theological anthropology is necessary to complete his Christology and his Mariology is necessary to understand the descent of the Spirit upon the Church. Perhaps these *lacunae* might be filled in the near future.

The fifteen essays of this volume do not equal the breath of the last published collection of essays for the Bonaventure centenary. However, these essays represent the combined work of an older generation of scholars with a new generation who continue to pursue the complexity and multidimensionality of Bonaventure's thinking, even beyond what Guardini initially sensed and articulated nearly a hundred years ago. The editors hope that the publication of this volume will inspire and encourage

future scholars, so that the new century we have recently entered will produce rich and new insights into the thinking of the Seraphic Doctor.

We wish to thank Julian Deahl of Brill Academic who first approached us with the idea of this volume. We thank those who have contributed. It was an arduous but rewarding journey. The senior editors are grateful for the editorial assistance of PhD student, Jared Goff, who recently completed his dissertation on Bonaventure's *De Mysterio Trinitatis.* It is only just that we include him as one of the editors. The editors dedicate this volume to all current and future doctoral students, who, like Romano Guardini, take on the mantle of studying the Seraphic Doctor.

Jay M. Hammond
Saint Louis University

J.A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv.
Saint Louis University

FOUNDATIONS

BONAVENTURE: LIFE AND WORKS

Marianne Schlosser
(trans. Angelica Kliem)

Probably in 1217 (some scholars opt for 1221), Bonaventure was born in Bagnoregio—in those days an episcopal residence located between Orvieto and Viterbo. During the canonization process,[1] his baptismal name was recorded as Johannes or Johannes Petrus. His parents were Johannes Fidanza, a medical doctor, and his wife Ritella. The dates during his early life can be roughly calculated from the first one which is certain: his election as general superior of his order on 2 February 1257. He was the seventh successor of St Francis. Usually one had to be at least forty years old in order to be eligible for such an office.

Unfortunately, little is known about his childhood and early youth except one autobiographical note (*Legenda Minor 7*, 8 and *Legend. Maior* Prol. 3): Here Bonaventure reports that as a child he had once been seriously ill but then recovered by the intercession of St Francis. From the report we cannot conclude for certain if this event meant a personal encounter between the child and St Francis, whether he was still alive or already a canonized saint (in 1228). Legend has it that it happened during the life time of St Francis and that the name "Bonaventura" goes back to a remark which the Poverello himself had made about the child. In any case the Fidanza family seems to have had connections with the Saint from Assisi or at least with the community of his brethren who had a convent in Bagnoregio.

Study and Teaching in Paris

Most scholars hold that Bonaventure took up his studies in Paris about the year 1235. Since the beginning of the twelfth century, Paris with its schools headed by distinguished teachers had been known as a "stronghold of the catholic faith" (*arx catholicae fidei*). About the year 1200, these schools developed into a "university," which means a corporation of teachers and

[1] *Acta Sanctorum*, 3 July (Antwerp: 1723), 811–860, at 811.

students from various walks of life and different nationalities. Scholarly degrees earned in such a university were recognized everywhere. In the bull *Parens scientiarum* (1231),[2] a kind of "Magna Charta" for the university, Pope Gregory IX granted the University of Paris the privilege of allowing those who had completed their studies in this institute to teach anywhere. Most other "high schools" were in the possession of a papal founding document or had been recognized by the pope as a *studium generale* with the right to confer doctorates. This illustrates the importance held by the University of Paris for the universal church. It also explains the attraction which this university had for the orders of mendicant friars which were not confined to a single diocese or country. And it was also the reason why the Pope intervened in the controversy between the mendicant orders and the university.

Bonaventure started his studies with the so-called *artes liberales* which would normally take up about six years plus two years as a practicing bachelor. It consisted of the "seven free arts" (grammar, rhetoric, dialectics or logic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and the theory of music) and constituted the system of general education in the antique and medieval world. These arts were called "free" because they were considered worthy occupations for a "free man." At the time of Bonaventure, however, these studies had already developed into proper philosophical studies which included natural philosophy, ethics and metaphysics. Normally, one would need to have completed these studies before entering a religious order. Thus we can assume that Bonaventure could have entered the Franciscan order about the year 1243 after which he studied theology for another five years.

Both the study of the *Arts* and of *Sacra doctrina* and that of the other sciences were based on reading and interpreting the works of renowned authors or texts (*auctoritates*). Theology was of course based on the sacred scriptures (*sacra scriptura, sacra pagina*). Therefore a professor of theology was officially known as *Magister in sacra pagina*. The scriptural texts were accompanied by the *Glossa*. It explained the biblical texts verse by verse with the help of the corresponding passages from the writings of the church fathers and early medieval authors; it had been composed during the twelfth century, mainly in the schools of Laon and of Peter Lombard (for the psalms and the letters of St Paul). The *Glossa* had an authority

[2] *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. Henricus Denifle and Aemilianus Chatelain, vol. 1 (Paris: 1889), n. 79 (136–139): hereafter *Chart* (page numbers in brackets).

second only to the scriptures themselves.[3] A bachelor first gave an introduction in reading the biblical texts and commentaries to the students. Lectures of a magister then led deeper into the matter, on to theological questions. This is clearly illustrated in the commentaries which Bonaventure himself composed during his time as a magister. These commentaries are interspersed with *quaestiones*: arguments pro and contra leading to a solution to the question as well as to answers to the opponents' objections.

Towards the end of his life, Bonaventure mentions four levels of *auctoritates* in his *Hexaëmeron*: sacred scripture comes first, then the explanation of the church fathers (*originalia sanctorum*); and since their texts are not always easily understood they are explained by texts of more recent theologians (*summae magistrorum*). In order to understand the philosophical expressions of these theologians, one also needs to study philosophy.[4]

Who were the authors that Bonaventure studied? Who were his teachers? In his research work, it is above all Jacques Guy Bougerol who has thrown light on to this question.[5] Bonaventure's Franciscan teachers were Alexander of Hales (d. August 1245) and Johannes de la Rochelle (d. February 1245), Odo Rigaldi (1245–1248), and William of Melitona.

From a book-shop list of books prescribed for students dating back to the year 1286 (which also states how much they could cost), we can conclude which texts must have been fundamental for studies in Paris. Obviously, the studies included entire works, not only excerpts. The canon of books consisted of almost all the works of St Augustine (*Enchiridion, De trinitate, Confessiones, De doctrina christiana, De Genesi ad litteram, De libero*

---

[3] Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: 1988), 165f. The Bible available to Bonaventure was apparently the *Biblia de littera et apparatu Parisiensi* (1226). In the church of San Nicola in Bagnoregio, a thirteenth-century Bible called the "Bible of St Bonaventure" is preserved. See *Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria*, Facsimile Reprint of the Strasbourg edition of 1480/81, with an introduction by M.T. Gibson and K. Froehlich (Turnhout: 1992).

[4] *Hex*. 19.10–13 (5, 421–422). Of course, every grade of descent signifies an increasing possibility of losing sight of the whole truth.

[5] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 43–120; and see his other studies: "Saint Bonaventure et le Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite," *Etudes Franciscaines Supplement* (1968): 33–123; "Saint Bonaventure et saint Bernard," *Antonianum* 46 (1971): 3–79; "Saint Bonaventure et Guillaume de Saint-Thierry," *Antonianum* 46 (1971): 298–321; "Saint Bonaventure et saint Anselme," *Antonianum* 47 (1972): 333–361.—Essays on Bonaventure's reception of the church fathers may be found in *San Bonaventura Maestro di vita francesana e di sapienza cristiana. Atti del Congresso internazionale per il VII centenario di San Bonaventura da Bagnoregio, Roma 19–26 settembre 1974*, 3 vols., ed. A. Pompei (Rome: 1976), and *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974. Volumen Commemorativum*, 4 vols. (Grottaferrata: 1974).

arbitrio, writings against Pelagianism, about moral-ascetic questions, letters, sermons, etc.), Dionysius the Areopagite with comments, Gregory the Great (*Moralia in Job, Homiliae*), Isidore of Seville, Anselm of Canterbury and Bernard of Clairvaux, with numerous works each mentioned by name, Hugh and Richard of St Victor. Other works are collections of sermons, the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor (Manducator), as well as the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacob da Voragine.[6] Of course, Bonaventure knows and quotes also other fathers of the church, such as Ambrose, Jerome and John Damascene as well as more recent authorities. In his brief work *De reductione artium ad theologiam*[7] he speaks of seven especially important theologians: Augustine is said to be the most distinguished church father in the field of systematic theology, equaled by Anselm of Canterbury among the more recent theologians. Gregory the Great and Bernard of Clairvaux are protagonists in preaching and moral theology, Dionysius and Richard of St Victor in mystical theology. Hugh of St Victor is said to be most versed in all these fields.[8]

It is understood that Bonaventure was open for every theological discussion of his time. He himself mentions that he differs on some points from the opinion of Peter Lombard as well as that of Alexander of Hales.[9] Bougerol points out that as a bachelor, Bonaventure used a copy of a commentary of Albert the Great when he composed his own commentary on the *Sentences*.[10] But as was the custom among scholars of those times,

---

[6] *Chart.* 1, n. 530 (644–650). Commentaries on Aristotle from antiquity are also listed, as well as basic texts for the study of law. Especially interesting are the contemporary theologians that were on stock: Bartholomaeus Anglicus, Alexander Neckam, Robert Kilwardby, William of Melitona, and others with single works; Peter of Tarantaise with *Sentences* commentaries and biblical commentaries, Thomas Aquinas with no less than sixteen titles, including the *Summa theologica* and the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the *Quaestiones disputatae* and *Quodlibeta*, a few commentaries, and the treatise *De perfectione vitae spiritualis*.

[7] Freely translated: "Human ability and knowledge as seen in the light of the science of faith" (5, 317–325). This treatise has always been recognized as indubitably authentic. A few years ago, Dieter Hattrup voiced his doubts: "Bonaventura zwischen Mystik und Mystifikation. Wer ist der Autor von De reductione?," *Theologie und Glaube* 87 (1997): 541–562. However, the recent research of Joshua Benson indicates the text's authenticity: "Identifying the Literary Genre of the *De reductione artium ad theologiam*: Bonaventure's Inaugural Lecture at Paris," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 149–178.

[8] Hugh's main work, *De sacramentis christianae fidei* (PL 176), exhibits in its portrayal of the development of faith a certain salvation-historical dynamic, that has been interpreted as being "similar to Bonaventure's"; see Bougerol, *Introduction*, 105.

[9] Ferdinand Delorme, *Collationes in Hexaemeron et Bonaventuriana quaedam selecta*, (Quaracchi: 1934), 357–362; or *II Sent.*, d. 44, dub. 3.

[10] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 115.

he hardly ever put names to quotations from contemporary theologians. They are marked "quidam" or "alia opinio," with the exception of William of Auvergne, who later became a bishop.

During the years 1248–1250, Bonaventure worked as a baccalaureus biblicus, which means that he had to introduce students to the study of biblical books. For this purpose Bonaventure chose a comment to the Gospel of Luke. This was certainly not just accidental, because in Luke's Gospel, Jesus is above all described as the saviour of the poor and as a teacher of prayer. After Bonaventure had been promoted to the rank of a magister, he once more revised his commentary, which fills the whole of vol. 7 in his *Opera omnia*.

During the two following years, 1250–1252, Bonaventure followed the normal course of a career as theologian by working as baccalaureus sententiarius, which meant giving comments on the four book *Sentences*. These consisted of a collection of quotations—mainly from St Augustine, but also from other church fathers and more recent theologians. In the middle of the twelfth century, these had been systematically ordered by Peter Lombard, who would soon be simply called "the magister." This work was to become a main source of knowledge for many generations of medieval theologians. The contents are divided and subdivided into *distinctiones* and *capitula*, and deal with subjects such as knowledge of God and the Trinity (I), creation, anthropology (II), christology, grace, virtue, gifts of the Spirit (III), sacraments and eschatology (IV). By means of these *Sentences* a young theologian was given the opportunity to show his abilities by explaining the text and the terminology, above all by formulating new systematic questions and finding solutions to them. Thus the commentary is written in the form of *quaestiones.* Each chapter (*distinctio*) of the text that has been used is subdivided into a number of questions. At first the pros and cons are stated, then the teacher gives the solution to the question (*Respondeo dicendum*) and finally speaks again to the opponent's arguments (*Ad primum, ad secundum*, etc.).[11] In 1252/53, when Bonaventure was a baccalaureus formatus shortly before his promotion, he put his commentary into writing. His *Commentary on the Sentences*

[11] The chronological order of Bonaventure's commentary of Peter Lombard's books is either I—IV—II—III (according to Ignatius Brady, "The Edition of the 'Opera Omnia' of St. Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 70 [1977]: 352–376; Bougerol concurs); or I—II—IV—III (according to Balduinus Distelbrink, "De ordine chronologico IV Librorum 'Commentarii in Sententias' S. Bonaventurae," *Collectanea Franciscana* 41 [1971]: 288–314).

is one of the most important of its kind.[12] It presents a complete theological concept with a fully developed profile. His Prooemium (1, 6–13), is especially impressive and gives us an insight into Bonaventure's self-understanding as a theologian. In this writing, he points out the characteristic features of theological science as *sapientia*: its specific content, its objective, and its method.[13]

First Phase of the Mendicant Controversy

Apparently, Bonaventure was admitted to his final exams in 1252/53 and consequently earned his doctorate as *Magister in sacra pagina* in 1253/54.[14] Obviously, however, he was not received into the Consortium Magistrorum until the year 1257—after the Holy See had strongly intervened on his behalf.[15] The reason for this is to be found in the tensions that had arisen at the University of Paris between the mendicant orders and their professors on the one hand and those professors who belonged to the secular clergy on the other. History speaks of this as the Mendicant Controversy.[16]

When in 1217, the first brethren of the order of Preachers had arrived in Paris and soon after that, in 1219, the first Friars Minor, they seem to have been well received. Very soon the new religious orders attracted numerous

---

[12] Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der Theologie seit Ausgang der Väterzeit* (1933; repr. Darmstadt: 1980), 67.

[13] Other revealing passages are: *I Sent.*, d. 3; d. 8 (cognition of God); *II Sent.*, d. 24 on the creation of man as an intellectual creature (discussions of the *intellectus agens*, the theory of cognition); *III Sent.*, d. 35, q. 1 and q. 3 (gifts of the Holy Spirit—*donum sapientiae, donum intellectus*—the gift of knowledge of God, theology, and mysticism).

[14] According to Brady, the doctoral examination did not take place until September 1255. However, the research of Jay Hammond illustrates that it occurred in April 1254, "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 179–226; on this occasion Bonaventure held a lecture (*inceptio*) based on *Perf. evang.*, q. 2. For the chronology, see Ignatius Brady, "The Opera Omnia of St. Bonaventure Revisited," in *Thomas and Bonaventure. A Septicentenary Commemoration*, ed. George F. McLean (Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association) 48 (Washington: 1974), 295–304; Idem, "The Edition."

[15] John F. Quinn, "Chronology of St. Bonaventure 1217–1257," *Franciscan Studies* 32 (1972): 168–186, at 184, presents a different hypothesis: The controversy in 1254/55 primarily concerned the Dominicans; Bonaventure was initially accepted to the *Consortium* after receiving his degree, and only later barred in 1256, as the conflict escalated to involve the Friars Minor as well.

[16] Yves Congar, "Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIII^{e} siècle et le début du XIV^{e} siècle," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 28 (1961): 35–151; M.-M. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne 1250–1259* (Paris: 1972); Ulrich Horst, *Evangelische Armut und Kirche. Thomas von Aquin und die Armutskontroversen des 13. und beginnenden 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: 1992).

recruits. One of the secular magisters, John of St Giles, was willing to lecture in the Dominican convent. The Friars Minor entrusted this task to Haymo of Faversham (who entered the order in 1224) and Alexander of Hales, who was later to become Bonaventure's teacher. In spite of the fact that the members of the mendicant orders had chosen the city for their missionary activities and were "universally" qualified for their universal mission, it soon became clear that they could not entirely adapt to the existing institution university. In May 1229, Roland of Cremona, magister in Bologna and lecturer of theology in several Dominican convents, qualified as a magister in Paris. This happened at a time when the University of Paris as a body had gone on strike in order to put economic pressure on the civic authorities. Between 1229 and 1231, professors and students left the city, many for Toulouse. However, lectures seem to have continued in the Dominican convent of Saint Jacques and, moreover, John of St Giles himself became a Dominican in 1230. Thus two professorships had fallen to the order of Preachers during the time of the university strike. When in 1236, Alexander of Hales entered the Friars Minor, there was resistance on the part of the secular professors.[17] It is not exactly clear, but quite possible, that the Franciscans also had two members among the regular professors, Alexander and John de la Rochelle (1238–1245). In any case, by February 1252, a statute had been passed by the majority of the professors, ruling that no religious order was allowed to hold more than one chair at a time. This was first of all a measure against the Dominicans, who held two chairs; but it was also directed against the presence of the two new religious orders at the university. The mistrust of the secular professors increased in the same measure as the success of the mendicants who were, moreover, interested in qualifying as many students as possible for the universal mission of the Church (*licentia ubique docendi*). Thus they were not interested in strikes and that was the main reason for the conflict: in April 1253, the secular professors punished the Franciscan William of Melitona as well as two Dominicans by expulsion from the Consortium Magistrorum. They were to be reaccepted only after swearing an oath to the university statutes. The oath was also required for the promotion of a baccalaureus. After Pope Innocent IV had objected to this measure on 1 July 1253, the professors reinforced it once more at the beginning of the academic year on 3 September. At that time, Bonaventure must have been a baccalaureus formatus very shortly before his promotion to the

[17] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 37.

doctorate, and it seems that his order tried to restore relationships with the university to normal. For this purpose it could be of help to replace the magister in charge, who at that time was William of Melitona, by a new person of balanced character, namely Bonaventure.

In present-day understanding, a strike seems to have been but a petty reason for such a conflict. But it shows to what extent the mendicant orders were about to change the situation in the church: they enjoyed papal privileges and were working across territorial borders. But it was not only rivalry which had sparked off this conflict; the mendicants also provoked suspicion and misapprehension among people because of their new way of life which was neither that of monks nor that of canons engaged in pastoral work. The academic teaching careers of the mendicants and their pastoral activities, above all those as confessors and as preachers, were the main reasons for the conflict. The mendicants' opponents—above all, their protagonist William of Saint-Amour[18]—used an argument from traditional ecclesiology, quoting among other texts the *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* of Dionysius which says: Teaching others is helping them to achieve greater perfection. In the church, this is the privilege not of "monks" but of bishops who are the successors of the apostles and of pastors who are the successors of the seventy-two disciples. The task of monks consisted in prayer and penance. In applying this model to the mendicants William ignores two important facts: unlike most monks of the early church, the mendicants who were studying, teaching and doing apostolic work were not lay people but many of them were priests, and they had been commissioned for work across territorial and diocesan borders by papal authority. Thus we find these and other arguments in the mendicants' writings of defense such as the *Perf. evang.* of Bonaventure and the *Contra impugnantes* of Thomas Aquinas.

Then another event occurred which led to an escalation of the situation. In 1254, the Franciscan Gerard of Borgo San Donnino had published a collection of the main writings of Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202). This was preceded by a comprehensive introduction with the title *Liber introductorius*

[18] *The Opuscula of William of Saint Amour. The Minor Works of 1255–56*, ed. A. Traver (Münster: 2003); Sophronius Clasen, "Die Kampfpredigten des Wilhelm von St. Amour gegen die Mendikantenorden," in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. Festschrift M. Bihl* (Kolmar: 1941), 80–95; "William of Saint Amour's Two Disputed Questions *De quantitate eleemosynae* and *De valido mendicante*," ed. A.G. Traver, *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 62 (1995): 295–342.

in Evangelium aeternum.[19] By the term "eternal gospel," Joachim himself had meant the spiritual understanding of the writings of the Old and the New Testament; the *Introductorius* claims that the New Testament is superseded by the "eternal testament," and dates the beginning of that *status* to the year 1260: From that time on, the church would be transformed into an entirely "spiritual" church, which means there was to come an era of the fullness of salvation in world history. According to the *Introductorius*, the order of St Francis was seen as the precursor of this perfection, because all who go barefoot—thus also the perfectly poor—are called to instruct others in the ways of perfection. In a way, the *Introductorius* constitutes a summary of Joachim's thinking which had been circulating since the 1240s, and not only among the members of the Franciscan order.[20] Especially the prophecies in the pseudo-Joachimite writings could easily be applied to the two mendicant orders. Soon after Joachim's death, Dominic and Francis had appeared in public. No wonder that the communities which they had founded—where contemplation was to be combined with apostolic preaching—were regarded as the fulfillment of the Calabrian abbot's prophecies. The "men of the Spirit" from whom he had expected the renewal of the church in the immediate future were to be preachers as well as contemplatives.[21] Both orders were aware of the challenge in their time in history as can be seen from a letter written jointly by the two superiors general in the year 1255.[22] There was

---

[19] The original text of the *Introductorius* has not survived, but its contents may be gleaned in part from the excerpted sentences compiled by the professors of Paris, see *Chart.* 1, n. 243 (272–276), and from the records of the papal committee that convened in Anagni to examine the matter; see Paul Zahner, *Die Fülle des Heils in der Endlichkeit der Geschichte. Bonaventuras Theologie als Antwort auf die franziskanischen Joachiten* (Werl: 1999), 207–315. Critical edition of the Anagni records: Heinrich Denifle, "Das Evangelium aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni," *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 1 (1885): 49–142.

[20] E.R. Daniel, "A Re-Examination of the Origins of Franciscan Joachimism," *Speculum* 43 (1968): 671–676. On the reception of the pseudo-Joachite works among the Dominicans see Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages. A Study in Joachimism* (Notre Dame: 1993), 161–174; on the prophetic self-image of the mendicant orders see Marianne Schlosser, *Lucerna in caliginoso loco. Aspekte des Prophetie-Begriffes in der scholastischen Theologie* (Paderborn: 2000), 236–251.

[21] Marjorie Reeves, *Prophecy*, 139–145; on the concept of monastic life in the main works of Joachim see Edith Pasztor, "Ideale del monachesimo ed età dello Spirito come realtà spirituale e forma d'utopia," in *L'età dello Spirito e la fine dei tempi in Gioacchino da Fiore e nel Gioacchimismo medievale. Atti del II Congresso internazionale di Studi Gioacchimiti 6–9 settembre 1984*, ed. A. Crocco, (San Giovanni in Fiore: 1986), 57–122.

[22] Humbert of Romans and John of Parma: *B. Humberti de Romanis Opera de Vita regulari*, ed. Joachim J. Berthier, vol. 2 (Rome: 1889), 494–500.

no real danger as long as the prophecies of Joachim or those attributed to him were just regarded as an additional legitimation for the respective orders themselves. More dangerous were speculations about the alleged proximity of the Last Day. And most dangerous were the descriptions of the Church during the time just before the Last Judgment: the texts allowed visions of an era without ecclesiastical offices or sacraments or any visible signs of redemption. This meant overstressing the importance of the Spirit's actions in individual believers at the cost of the sacramental dimension of the Christian life, which unites it with Christ's redemptive work.

No wonder then that in the midst of a situation marked by those many tensions, the publication of the *Introductorius* triggered off a scandal. William of Saint-Amour and his party saw in it the proof for the mendicants' lack of orthodoxy and fidelity to the church. In July 1254, they sent the book to Rome on the assumption that its author had been a Dominican. Without awaiting the papal verdict, the professors in Paris condemned 31 sentences in the *Introductorius* as well as in the following edition of Joachim's *Concordia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*.[23] In the face of these accusations, Pope Innocent IV decided to curb the privileges that had been granted to the mendicants. But he died in December 1254. His successor was Alexander IV, who had been Cardinal Protector of the Franciscan order and who now became a wise and determined supporter of the mendicants. After the papal commission had completed their examination of the *Introductorius*, having used the original works of Joachim for comparison, the pope wrote to the bishop of Paris ordering that the *Introductorius* was to be banned but at the same time the reputation of the Franciscans protected. Moreover, the pope persistently demanded that the magistri who had been excluded from the consortium were to be readmitted.

Angered by the papal intervention on behalf of the mendicants their opponents reacted with embitterment: in the spring of 1256, William of Saint-Amour wrote a polemical treatise with the title *De periculis novissimorum temporum—About the perils of the Last Days*, which was published in several editions.[24] Its title alludes to the eschatological expectations

---

[23] Modern edition: *Liber de Concordia Noui ac Veteris Testamenti*, ed. E. Randolph Daniel (Philadelphia: 1983). *Psalterium decem C(h)ordarum*, ed. Kurt-V. Selge (Hannover: 2009).

[24] Wilhelm of Saint-Amour, *Tractatus brevis de periculis novissimorum temporum*, in M. Bierbaum, *Bettelorden und Weltgeistlichkeit an der Universität Paris. Texte und Untersuchungen zum literarischen Armuts- und Exemtionsstreit des 13. Jahrhunderts (1255–1272)*

of the mendicants who were inspired by Joachim. William counters that the mendicants themselves are the eschatological threat to the church. He calls them pseudo-apostles and pseudo-prophets with alarming moral deficits—disobedience, arrogance, avarice—who were not free from heresy. This polemic pamphlet was sent to the pope by King Louis IX and damned by the former in October of the same year. But it took another year until two protagonists of the mendicant-opponents openly declared that "they wanted to receive the brethren of the order of Preachers as well as the Friars Minor—teachers and students alike—into the community of the university. They named especially the two doctors of theology, the Preacher Thomas Aquinas and the Franciscan Bonaventure" (12 August 1257).[25] During this time, Bonaventure had not been idle. Obviously he was serving as a *Magister in sacra pagina*, which meant he was *commenting the sacred scriptures*, holding *disputations (Quaestiones disputatae)*, and was *preaching*.[26]

Scriptural Commentaries

In keeping with the title belonging to a professor of theology, *Magister in sacra pagina*—teacher of sacred scripture—it was a professor's main task to give lectures on biblical texts. Besides the *Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke* mentioned above, Bonaventure's commentaries known to us include a commentary on Ecclesiastes, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* (6, 3–99)[27] and one on St John's Gospel, *Commentarius in Ioannem* (6, 239–530). They are "magistral" commentaries in which the running commentary on the biblical text is interspersed by frequent *quaestiones*. The prologues to these commentaries are of greatest interest. It has been questioned for some time now whether the Commentary on Wisdom, *In librum Sapientiae* (6, 107–233) is authentic, and today it is no longer

(Münster: 1920), 1–36. William's *Annotationes* to Bonaventure's *Quaestio reportata de mendicitate* can be found in Ferdinand Delorme, ed. *Collationes* [...] *et Bonaventuriana quadam selecta* (Quaracchi: 1934), 332–356; Edmond Faral, "Les 'Responsiones' de Guillaume des Saint-Amour," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 18 (1950): 337–394.

[25] *Chart.* I n. 317 (366): *quod fratres Praedicatores et Minores Parisiis degentes, magistros et auditores eorum et specialiter et nominatim fratres Thomam de Aquino de Ordine Praedicatorum et Bonaventuram de ordine Minorum, doctores theologiae ex tunc (...) in societatem scolasticam et ad Universitatem Parisiensem reciperent.*

[26] See also the overview in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano. Filosofia, teologia, spiritualità*, ed. Ernesto Caroli (Padua: 2008), 89–136.

[27] Manuel Arias Gonzalez, *El Comentario de San Buenaventura al Eclesiastés* (Rome: 1990).

counted among Bonaventure's works.[28] There are other commentaries which had erroneously been counted among Bonaventure's works, such as the Commentary on Lamentations, which was probably written by John Peckam (6, 607–651). On the other hand, it is possible that other commentaries which were authentic may have got lost. In the above mentioned book-shop list, we find two other titles attributed to Bonaventure, according to which he may have written two Commentaries on the Song of Songs and one Commentary on the Book of Proverbs. In addition to the commentary on the Book of Wisdom, the list mentions one on the Apocalypse and one on the Catholic Epistles.

Quaestiones Disputatae

The *Quaestio Disputata* is a form of discussion independent of a given text and with the objective to investigate the arguments on which a thesis is based. There were fixed rules according to which such a dispute had to be held: the date for it was noted in the agenda of the university and made publicly known. On the day fixed for a master's dispute, other lectures were cancelled in order to allow fellow professors and students to take part. The master opened the discussion by asking a question, e.g.: Is living on alms for the sake of Christ a way to holiness? Then the bachelors took over the actual discussion by giving arguments and contradicting each other. In order to be admitted to his doctorate, a bachelor needed to have taken part in such a dispute at least five times. In his lecture, following the dispute as soon as possible, the master had the task of sorting out the arguments that had been used by the bachelors and giving an answer to the question he had initially asked. In doing so, he had to give also a separate answer to each argument opposing his solution. Besides the regular form of these *Quaestiones Disputatae*, there existed another form called the *Quaestiones de quolibet (Quodlibeta)* which could be held during the seasons of Advent and Lent. Here the topic was not presented by the master; the participants were allowed to ask any question they chose.[29] We have three series of *Quaestiones Disputatae* (QD) led by Bonaventure, who afterwards wrote down the course which these disputes

[28] Dominic V. Monti, "A Reconsideration of the Authorship of the Commentary of the Book of Wisdom attributed to St. Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 79 (1986): 359–391.

[29] On university methodology, see James Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: his life, thought and work* (New York: 1974) and Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Toward Understanding St Thomas* (Washington: 1964).

had taken: *De perfectione evangelica, De scientia Christi*, and *De mysterio Trinitatis.* Scholarly research has unanimously dated these disputes to the time between 1254 and 1257, but there are some differences with regard to detailed dating of the events.[30] It is questionable if still other *QD* exist which could claim to have Bonaventure as their author besides those which have been included in the Opera omnia as indubitably authentic.[31] Thus, H.-F. Dondaine and I. Brady[32] objected to including *De theologia*[33] as well as *De caritate* and *De novissimis*.[34]

The QD *De perfectione evangelica* ("About perfection according to the gospel," 5, 117–198) deal with the three evangelical counsels, with special emphasis on *mendicitas* (mendicant poverty). Moreover, it constitutes a defense of the mendicant way of life—poverty, pastoral work and science—against the accusations of the secular professors. Bonaventure wants to prove that it is not "an unheard-of innovation" or "heretical exaggeration" (*superstitio*) if a religious community is not living on worldly possessions or on a fixed income. An important argument for him lies in the fact that with the canonization of Francis and Dominic this way of life has been approved by the universal church. Otherwise it would mean that the church would have sanctioned a way of life as exemplary which is in fact morally contestable. And that would be stating that the pope and the universal church had erred in important matters. Against the opponents' argument that the mendicants had no "mission" since they

---

[30] *Perf. evang.*: Bougerol dates it to 1254/55; Brady presumes that the *Perf. evang.* q. 2 is an *inceptio*, i.e., part of his doctorate, and dates it accordingly to September 1255; Quinn sees *Perf. evang.* as the reply to William of Saint-Amour's *De periculis*, which would date the treatise to 1256. Quinn supposes the *Scien. Chr.* q. 4 is the *inceptio* and dates it to 1254, Brady to 1256. Indisputably, *Myst. Trin.* was held some time after *Scien. Chr.*

[31] Balduinus Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae scripta, authentica, dubia vel spuria, critice recensita* (Rome: 1975), 12, lists two more *QD*: *De productione rerum* and *De imagine Dei et anima humana*. Since they match the corresponding passages from *II Sent.*, one may assume that they are authentic. Further *QD* in a Vatican manuscript (*De ieiunio, De oratione, De restitutione, De elemosyna et mendicitate*), which are still unedited but have made their way into the *Summa Halensis*, are most likely by Bonaventure (Distelbrink, 13f.). *De productione rerum (Quaestio est, utrum mundus productus fuerit ab aeterno?)* was edited by Antoine Van de Sande, "Une 'quaestio disputata' attribuée à Bonaventure, et commentaire," in *Bonaventuriana. Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol ofm*, ed. Francesco de Asís Chavero Blanco, vol. 2 (Rome: 1988), 507–533.

[32] Hyacinth-F. Dondaine, "De l'attribution à S. Bonaventure des questions du MS. d'Arras 873," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 19 (1949): 313–378; *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 19 (1952): 244–270. Ignatius Brady, "The Opera omnia," 302.

[33] George Tavard, "St. Bonaventure's Disputed Questions 'De theologia'," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 17 (1950): 187–236.

[34] Palémon Glorieux, *Sancti Bonaventurae Quaestiones disputatae de caritate, de novissimis* (Paris: 1950).

were successors neither of the apostles nor of the twenty-seven disciples, Bonaventure replies that they were commissioned by the pope for the universal church and were, moreover, important assistants of the clergy in the local church. Begging for alms instead of working for their livelihood with their own hands is necessary because of their pastoral activities. Those who proclaim the gospel are allowed to live on what people give them.

In seven separate questions, the QD *De scientia Christi* ("about the knowledge of Christ": 5, 3–43) deals first with God's knowledge, his *sapientia*, that is to say, the meaning of the ideas (qq. 1–3), and then goes on to discuss Christ's ways of wisdom, cognition and perception as God incarnate. These comments are of the greatest relevance with regard to Bonaventure's anthropology as well as his epistemology and his theology of grace. Famous above all is q. 4 in which he explains in great detail the kind of knowledge or cognition that is absolutely certain (*cognitio certitudinalis*) which the human person naturally possesses on account of the presence of truth in his mind. The following questions deal with perception by grace as, for example, in the case of the mystical union, and they are no less interesting. Possibly *Scien. Chr.* q. 4 was part (*inceptio*) of his doctoral promotion,[35] in which case it would be fitting to see in the *Sermo theologicus IV: Unus est magister vester, Christus*[36]*/ Unus omnium magister Christus* (5, 567–574) his sermon on the occasion of entrance into his new office, since this sermon deals with the same topic as *Scien. Chr*. q. 4.[37] In this sermon, Bonaventure discusses the three ways in which one can obtain knowledge of God: by faith, reason and contemplation (*fides—ratio—contemplatio*); above all, it gives a very clear summary of his epistemology and his teaching on illumination, leaving no room for misunderstanding. Moreover, this sermon is a beautiful testimony to his self-understanding as an academic teacher of theology.

In the QD *De mysterio Trinitatis* ("about the mystery of the Trinity": 5, 45–115), he connects the divine attributes of unity, simplicity, eternity etc., with God's tri-unity in persons. Here he speaks about central questions of fundamental theology. In q.1 a.1, we find Bonaventure's most detailed discussion of various proofs of the existence of God, their possibilities and their limits. In q.1 a.2, he discusses the relationship between

---

[35] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 5.

[36] This is the title in the edition by Renato Russo, *La metodologia del sapere nel sermone di S. Bonaventura 'Unus est magister vester, Christus'* (Grottaferrata: 1982).

[37] Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae Scripta*, 79, believes that an earlier date is possible: 1250, as other scholars too have suggested.

revelation and faith: faith in the Trinity is doubly attested by creation and by sacred scripture. But the most important "testimony" lies in the insight deep within the human person. When this natural perception of God as the extremely sublime being who is yet most kind (*lumen naturale: altissme et piissime de Deo sentiendum*) is supported by the revealed insights about the three Persons (*lumen supernaturale*), the human person will find the fulfillment of his natural perception and his desire in this message of revelation.

Sermons and Collections of Sermons

Preaching belongs to the magister's duties,[38] as do lectures about the scriptures and disputations. We have a series of fifty sermons which Bonaventure held for the Sundays of the liturgical year in the beginning or middle of the 1250s and which he published as a collection 1267/68 (*Sermones dominicales*).[39] In addition we have the truly *theological sermons*, which are longer (5, 535–579), as well as various *sermons* given in different years on various occasions in different places to a variety of people; these latter are found mainly in volume 9 of the Opera Omnia.[40] Since some are marked by notes about date and place, Bonaventure's sermons are not without importance for his biography or for following the routes of the journeys he later undertook when he was superior general[41] of his order. Sometimes, these written sermons are merely sketches giving the "theme" (the scripture text on which the sermon is based) and the "pro-theme" (a second word from scripture used as a means of introduction) as well as one or two main points in the sermon.

The so-called *collationes* are a special type of sermon. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the term "collation" is used in four different ways:[42] 1) for the spiritual lecture or conversation in a group of monks (cf. Cassian's

---

[38] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 7–9; Johann B. Schneyer, *Geschichte der katholischen Predigt* (Freiburg: 1969).

[39] *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones Dominicales*, ed. J.G. Bougerol (Bibliotheca Franciscana Medii Aevi) 27 (Grottaferrata: 1977).

[40] A number of sermons have been edited individually or in other collections: Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae Scripta*, 79–87. J.G. Bougerol edited two additional sermon collections: *Saint Bonaventure Sermons de diversis*, 2 vols. (Paris: 1993); and *Saint Bonaventure Sermons de Tempore. Reportation du Manuscrit Milano Ambrosienne A 11 sup.* (Paris: 1990).

[41] John F. Quinn provides a helpful list in "Chronology of St. Bonaventure's Sermons," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 67 (1974): 145–184.

[42] Jacqueline Hamesse, "'Collatio' et 'reportatio': deux vocables specifiques de la vie intellectuelle au moyen âge," in *Actes du Colloque Terminologie de la vie intellectuelle au moyen âge, Leyde-La Haye 20–21 septembre 1985*, ed. Olga Weijers (Turnhout: 1988), 78–87.

Collationes patrum), 2) for an exercise among students which served to repeat what they had learned; these had to be carried out according to certain rules, 3) for the short evening sermon during vespers on Sundays and feast days when the topic of the sermon given during the eucharistic celebration of that morning was once more taken up, 4) for the longer sermons about certain topics, given on Saturday evenings during the Lenten season (always called *collationes* in this connection). From Bonaventure we have three series of this kind from the years 1267, 1268 and 1273 respectively.

The *Collationes in Ioannem* are different from the other collations. They are sketches that were perhaps meant to be used for working out sermons. Their authenticity has been doubted.[43]

Breviloquium

This can be called Bonaventure's masterpiece from his years as a magister. It constitutes a small "summa" of theology which was to be widely used by later authors who quoted extensively from it. As the title says, it is a "short speech," a course in fundamental theological knowledge. Like the *Compendium theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas, which remained incomplete, Bonaventure's *Breviloquium* was written for the students among his brethren who had complained to him that they were often presented with theological contents in a way so little systematic that for them "the study of theology seemed like a dark impenetrable forest." In his prologue, Bonaventure first discusses fundamental theological questions: the relationship between the scriptures and divine revelation that is centered on the Word incarnate; scripture as God's word about God himself, as the foundation of human words about God (*theo-logia*). Bonaventure speaks about the importance of the act of faith as a requirement for deeper understanding, and gives an overview of the various literary forms of biblical sources and the most important exegetical principles. The following main body of the work is subdivided into seven parts with seventy-two chapters in all—symbolizing the seventy-two disciples who were sent out to proclaim the good news, as well as the seventy-two translators of the Septuagint. In these chapters, Bonaventure wants to present fundamental theological knowledge that is necessary for fruitful exegetic work in a

[43] Louis Bataillon does not consider them authentic: see Fortunato Iozzelli, "Le edizioni scientifiche del collegio San Bonaventura di Quaracchi-Grottaferrata," in *Editori di Quaracchi 100 anni dopo. Bilancio e prospettive. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale, Roma 29–30 maggio 1995*, ed. Alvaro Cacciotti and Barabara Faes de Mottoni (Rome: 1997), 27.

systematic order, because creative theological thinking presupposes well-founded theological knowledge. The seven classical dogmatic topics are presented in seven steps: divinity and Trinity, creation and anthropology, Christology and soteriology, grace and virtue, theology of the sacraments and eschatology. Since Bonaventure is convinced that neither scripture nor theology is studied merely for an increase of knowledge, but in order "to make the person better," that is, to sanctify the will, he cannot separate teaching about the faith from moral teaching. Therefore moral topics are dealt with in the chapters about creation and grace, just as liturgical and canonical matters are discussed in connection with the teaching about the sacraments.

The *Breviloquium* fascinates by its clarity—Bonaventure is an excellent stylist—and by its stringency in carrying out and limiting the contents to essentials. In every one of the seventy-two chapters, Bonaventure gives his theological definitions. Since theology is carried out *per additionem rationis ad credibilia*—by adding reason to the content of faith—he first presents each object of faith and then gives "reasons how they can be understood or appreciated" (*ratio ad praedictorum intelligentiam*). The truth that ought to be believed (*credibile*) is to be comprehended as being intelligible (*intelligibile*). In this connection, we should speak about Bonaventure's language. To him, truth is a cosmos, a beautifully arranged whole. Each single insight is connected with others, and this connection can and ought to be shown in the explanation. Whether it be a theological lecture or a sermon or a spiritual meditation, this order must be reflected in the language. Therefore he often presents his thoughts in three, four or seven steps, which in themselves may be subdivided. It is understood that the numbers used in scripture are especially important here: "Three" stands for the reality of the triune God and for everything directly connected with heaven, such as the theological virtues that unite the soul to God. "Four" stands for the earthly reality with the four elements and the four geographical dimensions which themselves also connect with the four ends of the cross. "Seven" has its origin in the seven days of creation, which will finally find their completion in the resurrection happening on the following, the "eighth" day. Other numbers with a symbolic character are twelve, forty, seventy-two, etc. This order—which can be found in all of Bonaventure's writings—is not merely an elegant literary form. It does not stand for its own sake but for the sake of pointing to the order, beauty and reasonability of the content: the literary form points to the content. At the same time, it is a teaching method, making it easier for the learner to memorise the content.

And it is not only the composition of the text that proves Bonaventure's language abilities. Also in the construction of every single sentence his language is vivid—he is a master of Latin syntax (*cursus*) and has a colorful lively style, at times using a variety of images. And yet he never falls into an artificial rhetorical mannerism, but aims at clarity and transparency.

Minister General

When in the autumn of 1257, Bonaventure was received into the Consortium Magistrorum, his life situation had already changed. On 2 February 1257, he had been elected minister general of the Friars Minor by their General Chapter in Ara Coeli. Thus he had accepted the office of leadership in his order in a critical situation: his immediate predecessor, John of Parma, who among his own brethren had been well accepted as a person, could no longer represent the order because he was known as supporter of Joachim of Fiore.[44] He had even been named as author of the *Liber Introductorius in Evangelium Aeternum*, which in the heated discussions of those days cast a queer shadow on the entire order. It was John himself who had proposed Bonaventure as his successor, and Pope Alexander IV was highly satisfied with the outcome of the election.[45]

Some biographers of Bonaventure interpret the year 1257 as a profound break in his life, so to speak a Franciscan conversion. However, this does not seem to hold with regard to his theological works. We cannot find any hints that Bonaventure might have been sorry to leave his academic career. During the years he had composed his written works, it had always been with view to serving the spiritual life by means of scientific insight. In a sermon from those years we read: "The words of teaching are hollow without the testimony of life. Only both together make a complete whole."[46] Not only had he been forced to deal with arguments against the mendicants while he worked as a magister, but also with opponents from among his own brethren in the order who were afraid that the original charism of poverty, humility and simple gospel living would be given up

---

[44] *Giovanni da Parma e la grande speranza, Atti del III Convegno storico di Greccio, 3–4 dicembre 2004*, ed. Alvaro Cacciotti and Maria Melli (Milan: 2008).

[45] The bull *Dilecto filio Fratri Bonaventurae (. . .) Ut ministerium tibi*: *Bullarium Franciscanum* 2, n. 374 (253).

[46] *Sermones dominicales*, ed. Bougerol, *serm.* 26, n. 7 (317).

for the sake of studies that earn academic titles[47] and give a feeling of superiority over others. Already in the Prooemium to his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Bonaventure clearly states that not only is scientific theology permitted, but that its goal is the service of others (strengthening their faith) and showing them the way to holiness. Even though there may be unnecessary things among those that are studied—like "chaff" among the wheat—the "breath of enthusiasm for God" (*flatus devotionis*) will have no difficulty in separating the one from the other.[48] In *QD Perf. evang.*, Bonaventure proves of what great importance mendicant poverty is to him. It is certainly not by chance that Bonaventure in his biography of St Francis records the following: When Francis was once asked whether it be allowed for learned brethren to continue their studies, his answer was: "Yes, I like that. But they should follow the example of Christ who prayed more than he read. So they should not tire in praying zealously; they should not just study in order to know how to speak well but also how to put into practice what they have heard and lead others to do the same. I want my brethren to be disciples of the gospel so that their progress in knowledge of the truth may at the same time be progress in purity and simplicity of heart."[49]

We might say Bonaventure made this his own programme. Later, in the *Hexaëmeron*, the reportator says: "And he (Bonaventure) added that St Francis had said he wanted his brethren to study—as long as they themselves did first what they taught others. Knowing many things but not tasting them spiritually is of little use."[50] Conversely, the theologian is present in each of his spirituals works. The literary form will, of course, vary with the kind of work, since one speaks differently in a sermon than in a disputation, and this influences the literary style. But unless the reader can fall back on his philosophical-theological background, he would not understand a text like the *Itinerarium*, which is considered to be a classical work of Franciscan mysticism. And the *Legenda maior* was likewise written with the help of a theological programme. Even the much disputed

---

[47] See the question whether one may allow oneself to be called "Master" contrary to the Gospel (Matt. 23:8–10): *Tri. quaes. mag.* (8, 331–336) and *Chr. mag.* (5, 567–574).

[48] *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 12 (8, 335). See also Marianne Schlosser, *Cognitio et amor. Zum kognitiven und voluntativen Grund der Gotteserfahrung bei Bonaventura* (Paderborn: 1990), 173–186.

[49] *Leg. maj.* 11.1 (8, 535).

[50] *Hex.* 22.21 (5, 440): *Et addebat quod beatus Franciscus dixerat, quod volebat, quod fratres sui studerent, dummodo facerent prius, quam docerent. Multa enim scire et nil gustare, quid valet?*

Sermons about the Work of the Six Days (*Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, 1272) would certainly have been held in a different form if Bonaventure had not been professor in Paris before. Just as he remained devoted to the vast capacity of the human mind (*capax Dei*), so he was at the same time convinced of the importance of faith for intellectual work.

Bonaventure knew that he had taken on a heavy burden. He also knew that the accusations of the mendicant-opponents were not entirely unfounded and that the failures of the brethren would always be mercilessly used against them. Thirty years had passed since the death of their founder, and the order of St Francis had by now grown to about 30,000 brethren in 32 provinces. This immense influx caused the Poverello's former companions who were still alive to be deeply worried about the ideals of the original founding charism. What kind of spiritual formation should all these brethren receive? Religious zeal on the one hand met with rather lax ideas on the other. Moreover, there were new tasks to be tackled in fidelity to the original charism and the tradition of the order. Some brethren mourned the loss of simplicity that had been lived by the first generation, and they considered it a mistake to risk the simple Gospel living for the sake of academic studies. Thus Bonaventure knew not only the arguments of the secular professors but also the reservations on the part of his own brethren.[51]

Works Related with to His Own Order

The first letter of the new minister general to the provincials is dated 23 April 1257. It reflects the situation at that time:[52] Bonaventure deplores the malpractices that have crept in among the brethren. Financial means are necessary for many of the tasks that have to be fulfilled by the order but they are often demanded immodestly and spent without prudence and responsibility; this is contrary to the Franciscan ideal of poverty. Bonaventure also complains that there are brethren who live neither a life of contemplation nor of pastoral activities but go idle and live at the cost of others. Luxurious buildings and too many relationships with worldly people are detrimental to the reputation of the community. He also deplores that tasks are entrusted to brethren who lack sufficient maturity to fulfill

---

[51] *Tri. quaes. mag.* could be directed at Roger Bacon (according to F. Delorme) or John Peckam (according to E. Longpré).

[52] *Epist. 1 ad omnes Ministros provinciales et Custodes Ordinis Fratrum Minorum* (8, 468f.)

them; and he exhorts those in responsibility to be above all careful in choosing which candidates they accept and to whom they entrust the formation of novices. He intended to reform the order from the top down and announced he would journey to all places and hold visitations in the convents in order to check the implementation of this reform. And in fact he undertook numerous journeys from the small convent of Mantes—situated between Rouen and Paris—that took him to various places within France, to England, Spain, Germany and Italy where alone he was sixteen times. During his sixteen years in office, Bonaventure really did everything in his power to form his order into a true community.

In support of the reform, the laws that had so far been in effect were compiled into a book of constitutions, the *Constitutiones Narbonenses*, which were promulgated by the General Chapter held in Narbonne in 1260. The Chapter of 1266 took them up once again and added explanations.[53] Laws alone were, however, not thought to be sufficient for rekindling the fire of the original zeal; good example was believed to have greater effect than exhortation and laws. Therefore during the same Chapter, Bonaventure was given the task of writing an official vita of St Francis. The result was the *Legenda maior* which was intended to serve as table reading, and the *Legenda minor* to be used during the office of matins.[54] For this work, Bonaventure had collected and ordered the material found in various different sources, condensing and shortening it. Above all, he created a biography of the founder which was composed according to theological principles. Thus in 1266, the General Chapter of Paris declared the *Legenda maior* to be the official biography of the founder and decided that all other legends were no longer to be used. Many authors—both in the past and in more recent times—have shown little understanding for this measure. It has, however, to be seen in the context of the tensions with which the order had been confronted during the past thirty to forty years, tensions that had been caused by the mendicant conflict and by the problem with the Joachites. This might explain why Bonaventure did not include certain narratives in his *Leg. Maj.*, or shortened them by his interpretation. He did

[53] *Explanationes Constitutionum Generalium Narbonensium* (8, 450–455); ed. F. Delorme, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 18 (1925): 511–524. The so-called *Definitiones* of the Chapter of Narbonne were edited by F. Delorme, "Definitiones Capituli Generalis Narbonensis 1260," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 491–504, and A. Little, "Definitiones capitulorum generalium ordinis fratrum minorum 1260–1282," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 7 (1914): 676–682.

[54] The *Leg. min.* comprises seven books divided into nine short chapters each, intended for the office of readings on the feast of St Francis and the following octave.

not want to provide weapons for further attacks of the mendicants' opponents. Moreover, a *Legenda* is not just a simple biography offering exact facts and dates; a *Legenda* is the attempt to paint a certain picture of a person or at least some detail of a picture. Especially for the formation of the young novices—which at that time was problematic—it was of great importance to present the right image of their founder.

In Bonaventure's *Leg. Maj.*, the life-story of Francis is modeled entirely by his following in the footsteps of Christ crucified.[55] He is "the angel of the sixth seal" because he bears the stigmata which are "the sign of the living God." Until the end of time, the cross will remain the sign over this world. On the one hand, it is the sign of human earthly reality broken by sin; on the other hand, it is the sign of victory. By this very sign, Francis had been drawn into the most intimate union with Christ. It is not a new era of salvation which has begun with Francis; rather, it is a new time of remembering the center of the history of salvation: Christ emptied himself until death, even until death on the cross, to let humanity find peace with God. The Tau-cross is the sign of salvation, and Francis wishes "peace and salvation" according to the words "the Lord himself had revealed to him."[56] Thus Francis becomes the messenger and "precursor" who "prepares the way for the Lord" by rekindling the love which in the hearts of the faithful had grown cold.

In this sense Francis also becomes the "second Elijah." It is known that Joachim of Fiore had shown great interest in the figure of Elijah because it is only this prophet of whom scripture says explicitly that he will come once more before the (second) glorious coming of the Lord. "The preachers of the third status"—which can only mean: after the transformation from the second to the third status has taken place—will find their prototype in Elijah, who as a "man like fire" represents the Holy Spirit.[57] Not only Francis, but also Dominic and other famous preachers are often seen in connection with this prophet, the precursor of Christ's second coming.

---

[55] See Sophronius Clasen, *Franziskus—Engel des sechsten Siegels. Sein Leben nach den Schriften des hl. Bonaventura* (Werl: 1962), introductio.

[56] St Francis, *Testament*, 23.

[57] Joachim of Flora, *Expositio in Apocalipsin* (1527; repr. Frankfurt a.Main: 1964), 148r: *quia tertius iste status saeculi, qui futurus est in fine mundi, non in Henoch aut in Moyse, sed tantum in Helya designatur.* See S.-L. Zimdars-Swartz, "The Third Status in De vita Sancti Benedicti and Other Minor Writings Attributed to Joachim of Fiore," in *L'età dello Spirito*, 347–355: Bernard McGinn, "Joachim of Fiore's Tertius Status: Some Theological Appraisals," ibid., 219–236; E.R. Daniel, "The double procession of the Holy Spirit in Joachim of Fiore's Understanding of History," *Speculum* 22 (1980): 469–483.

Bonaventure, too, explicitly points to the parallels between Francis—who had been baptized with the name of John the Baptist—and Elijah. But Elijah is not in the first place presented as a model of perfect poverty and trust in divine providence,[58] as might be presumed. For Bonaventure, it is above all the "inner fire" and the "fiery speech" of the prophet that are central.[59] It is because of these attributes that people thought Elijah had returned to earth when they met Jesus.[60] And it is for the same reason that Francis has been compared with Elijah: Christ's fire has brought about in Francis that fiery zeal for the salvation of people.[61]

In his *Leg. Maj.*, Bonaventure not only calls Francis "the angel rising from the East [with the sixth seal] who bears the sign of the living God"—meaning the stigmata—but also calls him a man in the spirit of Elijah. When the brethren saw their founder carried "in a fiery chariot" it was to tell them that they should "like true Israelites follow the one who like Elijah had been made by God a chariot and charioteer for all who are filled with the Spirit."[62] Thus the eyes of the brethren had been opened, as formerly the eyes of Elisha, and they understood that the teaching (*doctrina*) as well as the living example (*vita*) of Francis were the sure way to salvation for them. The "fiery chariot" stands as a symbol for his infusion with the prophetic spirit, his mission as servant or messenger (i.e., "angel") and his being on fire with the love of the Seraphim.[63] Even though the comparison with Elijah points to the Latter Day, which is not to be understood in terms of a Joachimite concept of salvation-history. According to Bonaventure's understanding, with Francis and also Dominic a new awakening in the history of the church is beginning, but it is Christ crucified, rather than the Holy Spirit, who transforms Francis into his own image.[64]

---

[58] As in *Perf. evang.* q. 2 a. 2 (5, 130a); as an exemplum of fasting: *Apol. Paup*. 6, 18 (8, 271).

[59] *Comm. Jn.* 10, n. 57, q. 4, ad 1 (6, 394); *Comm. Luc.* 1.17, n. 28 (7, 17); 9.33, n. 61 (7, 236).

[60] *Comm. Luc*. 12.49, n. 70 (7, 331).

[61] *Col.* to *Serm. II de b. Francisco* (9, 581).

[62] *Leg. Maj.* 4.4 (8, 513–514): *ut tanquam veri Israelitae post illum incederent, qui virorum spiritualium, ut alter Elias, factus fuerat a Deo currus et auriga.*

[63] *Leg. Maj*. prol., n. 1 (8, 504b): *prophetali quoque repletus spiritu necnon et angelico deputatus officio incendioque seraphico totus ignitus.*

[64] Cf. *Comm. Luc.*, 9.30, n. 54 (7, 234): At the transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor, Moses and Elijah appeared *et dicebant excessum eius* ("they spoke about his end"). Bonaventure interprets: They spoke of Christ's "excessive amount (*excessus*) of humility, poverty, pain and love." No one testified to this in word and lifestyle more than Francis. In this way as well, he is like Elijah. See Joseph Ratzinger, *Geschichtstheologie*, 31–33; Ilia Delio, "From Prophecy to Mysticism: Bonaventure's Eschatology in Light of Joachim of Fiore," *Traditio* 52 (1997): 153–178, esp. 153–159, 169, 175. Delio sees the decisive difference between Joachim and Bonaventure in the significance they placed on the *crucified* Christ,

In the Opera Omnia compiled by Quaracchi, we find various works which are nowadays no longer considered to be authentic, e.g., *De sex alis seraphim* (8, 131–151). Brady[65] assumes that this has by mistake been included in the list of works which was compiled by Bartholomew of Pisa in the place of the *Itinerarium*, which is surprisingly missing there. Brady also points out that this work is found in only five codices, which can all be dated back to the time after Bonaventure's canonization (1482). Moreover, he rightly remarks that the Latin style in this work is different from that in Bonaventure's other works. Brady sees similar differences in content and style in several other works which he therefore does not consider to be authentically Bonaventure's works: *Determinationes quaestionum circa regulam Fratrum Minorum* (8, 337–374; already Sophronius Clasen had doubted the authenticity of this title),[66] *Quare fratres minores praedicent* (375–385), *Sermo super Regulam* (438–448), *Epistola de imitatione Christi* (499–503), and *Expositio super regulam* (391–437). The lengthy discussion of these works does not yet seem to have come to an end: for a long time, Longpré defended their authenticity, whereas Delorme doubted it. In more recent years, Clasen and Daniel believe Bonaventure to be the author,[67] whereas Brady and Harkins disagree.[68] The *Epistola de sandalis apostolorum* (386–390) could have been written by John Peckam,[69] Brady sees the *Epistola continens XXV memorialia* (491–498) in connection with the Cistercians.

Itinerarium mentis in Deum

Before travelling to Narbonne to attend the General Chapter, Bonaventure visited the Franciscan places in the Rieti Valley and met brethren from the first generation who were still living there. In the autumn of 1259, he

---

which is the focus of Bonaventure's attention. On the significance of the Elijah typology in Joachim and Bonaventure see Marianne Schlosser, "Princeps noster Elias," in *Edith-Stein-Jahrbuch* 8 (2002): 48–64, esp. 58–61, 63f.

[65] Ignatius Brady, "The Writings of St. Bonaventure Regarding the Franciscan Order," in *San Bonaventura Maestro*, vol. 1, 89–112.

[66] Sophronius Clasen, *Der hl. Bonaventura und das Mendikantentum* (Werl: 1940), 26–28.

[67] Sophronius Clasen, "Bonaventuras Expositio super Regulam fratrum minorum," in *San Bonaventura Maestro*, vol. 2, 531–570; E.R. Daniel, "The Desire for Martyrdom: A Leitmotiv of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 32 (1972): 86f.

[68] Conrad Harkins, "The Authorship of a Commentary on the Franciscan Rule Published among the Works of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 29 (1969): 157–248, considers the work "according to the mind of Bonaventure, though not from his pen" (247).

[69] Brady, "The Edition," 374; Bougerol, *Introduction*, 264.

retreated to Mount La Verna, where Francis had received the stigmata. Here in the solitude of his spiritual retreat, he created what is considered to be his most famous work: the *Pilgrimage way to God (Itinerarium mentis in Deum)*. In late antiquity, the literary form of "itinerary" was used to describe a journey, mostly a pilgrimage to the Holy Land: in *terram sanctam*. Bonaventure's *Itinerarium* describes the journey *in Deum*; it is a description of a person's spiritual journey; its destiny is God, who wants to dwell in the human soul as in a spiritual Jerusalem. It is a journey not undertaken on foot, but by means of the mind (*mens*), which is the soul as far it has the capacity for God. It does not bring about a change of place, but an interior transformation (*transformatio/transitus*). The change of heart happens by drawing near to the beloved, i.e., becoming more like that person. The means by which the presence of God may be experienced is a form of reflection: *speculation*.[70] The *Itinerarium* contains six of these *speculationes* in three pairs. The meditation starts with the present reality, which can be perceived by the senses. The person meditating is supposed to see that this reality would not exist without God as its origin or without his support. Next, the person should see himself as a creature with intellect and free will, and understand that he could not be this enlightened, reflecting, desiring person if his understanding and desire were not related to the ultimate Truth and Love. Lastly, God himself becomes the object of reflection: God as perfect Being—which the human person can grasp only by making proper use of his intellect—as well as God, the Triune Being who can be known only by God's revelation in Christ. In the *Itinerarium*, all human knowledge of creation (including natural philosophy), all knowledge about the human person, and lastly, all knowledge of God—be it gained by philosophical reflection or revealed—becomes a lesson in how to "see" God's presence.

However, only if they are grounded in the love of Christ can these reflections lead a person to "taste" the *pax exstatica*. This is the deep meaning of the crucified seraph which appeared to Francis on La Verna and which Bonaventure suddenly understood as an inspiration for the *Itinerarium*:

> And staying there [on Mount La Verna], while I meditated on the ascent of the mind to God (…) there occurred that miracle which happened in the same place to the blessed Francis himself, the vision namely of the winged

[70] *Speculatio* may be derived from *speculum* ("mirror"), or from *specula* ("lookout"). Both definitions make sense, whereby the latter better expresses the "yearning/longing" particular to the pilgrim, who is on the lookout for his destination. See *Bonaventura, Der Pilgerweg des Menschen zu Gott*, transl. M. Schlosser (St. Ottilien: 2010), 112.

> Seraph in the likeness of the Crucified. While looking upon this vision, I immediately saw that it signified the suspension of our father himself in contemplation and the way by which he came to it.[71]

Although we can find in this work various inspirations from the spiritual tradition (Augustine, Bernard and above all Richard of St Victor), it is structured around Francis' vision of the seraph, which constitutes its center. With the help of its six "wings" (the six speculations), this contemplation aims at drawing nearer to Christ crucified by love (Prol. 3–4): Bonaventure purposely calls the mystical union "suspension" (as being suspended on the cross) and "transitus" ("pascha" meaning transit: 7, 2). No manner of sophisticated contemplative method can help to attain the inner "peace beyond comprehension" without this inner union with Christ. Without it, they remain nothing but intellectual exercises which cannot transform the soul. Reading the *Itinerarium* takes time: the food offered has to be "chewed and ruminated" in order to release its taste (Prol. 5).

Triplex via

There is yet another small volume that is equally famous, one of the best known works of mystical theology in the Middle Ages, which was translated into several vernacular languages, was known under several different titles, was shortened or enlarged, paraphrased and edited. There are more than three hundred surviving Latin manuscripts from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century: *De triplici via (About the threefold way)* (8, 3–18; Prolegomena n. 9).

Unlike the *Itinerarium*, this work does not contain any biographical notes. During Bonaventure's canonization process (1482), however, the *Triplex via* together with the *Itinerarium* was named as a work which gives evidence of the Seraphic Doctor's holiness. This small work became so widely known because it was used as a compendium of mystic-ascetical theology: It constitutes a summary of the spiritual tradition of former centuries, combined with an independent synthesis and embedded in the context of a comprehensive concept of theology as *sapientia*, inspired by Franciscan spirituality. Probably it was the happy combination of all these

---

[71] *Itin.*, prol., n. 2 (5, 295): *dum mente tractarem aliquas mentales ascensiones in Deum, inter alia occurrit mihi illud miraculum, quod in praedicto loco contigit ipsi beato Francisco, de visione scilicet Seraph alati ad instar Crucifixi. In cuius consideratione statim visum est mihi, quod visio illa praetenderet ipsius patris suspensionem in contemplando et viam, per quam pervenitur ad eam*, trans. George Boas (Baltimore: 1953).

factors that caused the great impact which this work has had far beyond the sphere of Franciscan theology and mysticism.

The *Triplex via* has fittingly been characterized as "summa of mystical theology": 1) The material is presented in a logical order, subdivided in a differentiated manner helpful in teaching. The inner order of the material is reflected in the subdivisions; the cosmos can be seen in the clear structure of the text which expresses the ordered beauty of truth itself.[72] Also in view of its literary form and choice of vocabulary, the text is a masterpiece. All this indicates that *Triplex via* cannot belong to Bonaventure's early works. Exact dating has not been possible; a time between 1260 and 1269 is plausible. 2) As far as possible, anything belonging to mystic-ascetical theology should find a place, so that the inner relationship of the individual elements becomes clear and the whole is kept in view. 3) Traditions have been included and brought into a synthesis. The basic structure of *meditatio—oratio—contemplatio* goes back to a monastic tradition even as far as the time of the desert fathers; but it was above all predominant in the mystical theology of the twelfth century.[73] Bonaventure combines this triad of spiritual exercises with two other triads: the classification used by Gregory the Great[74] for the faithful on their pilgrimage to God, as beginners (*incipientes*), progressing (*proficientes*), and perfect ones (*perfecti*), and the triad which is known in connection with Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite: purgation (*purgatio*), illumination (*illuminatio*), and perfection or union (*perfectio/unio*), which had long before become standard in theology.[75] Bonaventure hardly quotes names in the *Triplex via*; the thoughts of other authors have been assimilated by his own concepts. This can also be seen in his use of scripture: words from scripture are not illustrative quotations, but are part of the train of thought and adapted to the literary style.

The reader must be capable of using *Trip. via* like a compendium. It is not a book of meditations that have already been worked out; rather, it is like a map inviting the reader to set out on this journey. The arrangement in steps is not to be understood as a description of mystical elevation, but

---

[72] On two occasions, additions have been inserted to the original text: Part 2, nn. 9–11; Part 3, nn. 9–13. The Quaracchi editors considered these passages to be authentic, although they interrupt the coherent structure of the *Triplex via*. The passages might be perceived as additional, supplemental reflections (*dilatationes*), also found in the *Itin.*, 2.14, 2.10, 3.6, 4.5f.

[73] For example Guigo II: *Scala claustralium* 12 and 14; Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon* 3, ch. 10.5, ch. 9.

[74] *Mor.* 24.28; *Ez.* 2.3,3–5.

[75] See Francis of Assisi, *Letter to the Entire Order*, 51.

rather as a systematic offer of advice about how one should prepare oneself, what has to be taken into account and which attitude is necessary. Instead of reading the text as a whole, the reader should rather stay for a while with each thought—often presented in just one short sentence—and spiritually follow each advice; otherwise *Trip. via* remains nothing but a meager system. Bonaventure is not interested in a theoretical teaching system but in leading to mystical experience. In *Trip. via*, he wants to show the way to reaching one's goal of becoming formed to the image of God (*deiformis*, "God-like") already in this earthly life. In contemplation, a person not only tastes the "sweetness of God,"[76] but is led to spiritual transformation.

The goal of being more and more transformed after the likeness of God (*deiformis gratiae*) by holiness, knowledge of God, and love of God is to be achieved by means of a "threefold way," namely, the best known monastic practices: meditation (*meditatio*, pars 1), prayer (*oratio*, pars 2), and contemplation (*contemplatio*, pars 3). The person is transformed according to God's image in as much as he has a share in God's attributes. This happens by grace, by which the human person is drawn into a relationship with God as a child, a friend, even a spouse of God. In this way, healing and perfection of the soul's spiritual powers are wrought. Bonaventure calls this new "order" by grace *hierarchizatio.* Whereas Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite uses the term *hierarchizatio* mainly to describe the order of the intelligible cosmos, Bonaventure uses it in relation to the history of salvation. Here, *hierarchia* is the holy order intended by God to help the human person to become whole and holy—within himself as well as in all his relationships. This order has been disturbed by sin and all its effects. By means of *hierarchizatio*, this order is restored by grace.[77] The triune God himself is the highest *hierarchia*. God is peace (i.e., holiness), truth, and love. While these three attributes all belong to God's being, they may each be attributed in a special way to one of the three divine Persons *per appropriationem.* The spiritual way of becoming transformed according the image of God means that the human person takes part in God's attributes and grows in them (cf. Prol. 1; 3, n. 1). This transformation will be complete only after the human person has

[76] See the excellent article by J. Chatillon, "Dulcedo. Dulcedo Dei," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, vol. 3, 1777–1795.

[77] See also *Itin.* 4.

reached his heavenly home: in the everlasting possession of God (*tentio, pax*), the beatific vision (*visio*), and perfect love (*dilectio, fruitio*).

In faith, hope, and charity this *deiformitas* is already basically present during this earthly life, because by these divine virtues the human person shares in God's fidelity, truth, and goodness. The transformation is deepened step by step with the help of the spiritual exercises of *meditatio, oratio, contemplatio.* Each one of these three exercises supports in its own way the person's growth in holiness (or purity), knowledge, and love. Thus, they are not three different ways, but one single way which in each of its steps includes all three attributes, because God is always unchangeably holy, perfect truth, and blissful love. *Trip. via* offers a "way" not divided into a series of phases each complete in itself, but rather marked by fundamental elements of the interior life which return in different forms in every phase. It includes the experiences of contrition and longing, which result in self-knowledge (*purgatio*), experiences of the widening of the heart by gratitude and marvelling at the work of the creator and saviour (*illuminatio*), and the experiences of security, love, and joy in God (*perfectio/unio*; 1, 18).

The spiritual journey always starts with self-knowledge or purgation (1, 3–9; 2, 2; 3, 2). This is because the human person cannot experience the consolation of God's love unless he realizes how much he is in need of consolation; he cannot comprehend grace as grace unless he understands that he does not deserve it. The experience of contrition and the desire for sanctification by God return in each step in a new and more intensive way. The meditation starts with an examination of conscience (*stimulus conscientiae*). Bonaventure points to basic wrong attitudes which cause all the individual failures because every sin is the result of either an evil passivity or laziness (*negligentia*) or of inordinate desire (*concupiscentia*) or of bad will (*nequitia*), as for example in the sin of envy. The entire chapter has been inspired by the classical teaching of the seven (or eight) vices, but is marked by Bonaventure's anthropology.

The *oratio*, too, begins with a prayer of contrition (*deploratio miseriae*), and the *contemplatio* with the pain of remorse and the burning desire to belong to God entirely and forever, even to give one's life in martyrdom (3, 2). On the path of *illuminatio*, the person reflects on the wonderful deeds of God: creation, salvation, and glorification. It is essential to reflect on God's deeds not in an abstract and general manner, but in relation to one's own person. In the step of *meditatio*, the person should remember which sins have been forgiven him personally and reflect on the blessings which he personally has received from God (1, 2). In *prayer* he is to

address God's mercy, filled with confidence and longing, and supported by the community of the Church on earth and in heaven (2, 3). In the stage of *contemplatio* he is to reflect on the wisdom of God which to the human eye seems like folly, namely, Christ crucified (3, 3). Without doubt, we find a climax in this chapter. Walking "to the splendor of truth" (*ad splendorem veritatis*) does not mean primarily gaining insights about God, but exposing oneself to the light of divine truth and allowing oneself to be transformed by it. One can find this truth by following the footsteps of Christ (*per imitationem Christi*). Interior transformation happens by meditating in faith and love on Christ's suffering on the cross. Meditating on certain aspects of the passion should help the person to grow in a Christ-like attitude of kindness, patience, courage, obedience. The transformation is complete when a person longs for the love of Christ to share in his suffering, in order to have communion with him—like Paul and Francis. Only after entering into the mystery of the cross in this existential way he will be able "to see the truth" in the cross (*contemplatio veritatis*). In the actions and the suffering of Christ, the truth about God shines forth: how much he cherishes the human person, how the world is a stage for enacting the acceptance or refusal of salvation, what bliss and disaster are, sin and justice (3, 4).

Whereas the conscience is most important for purgation, and the understanding for comprehending the truth, it is only by the power of desire and love that union with God can be reached. Love is like a weight pulling the person to a spiritual place of rest; or it is a "fire" whose flames reach upwards. In the medieval understanding, fire is the spiritual element which causes transformation. Only the person who loves God will be "of one spirit" with God. In the human person, the love of God is at first only weak, and has to be strengthened in meditation (1, 15–17). Here one is to reflect how exalted and how worthy of love Christ is. Love is expressed in the *prayer of adoration (latria)* as an exchange of loving words of mutual pleasure in each other (*complacentia*): the human person wishes to please God alone and to find pleasure only in God, and wishes that ultimately all people will partake of this peace and pleasure.

In this way, the intimacy between God and the individual person grows into an apostolic love of all people. Thus the person becomes like Christ and like Paul: he is crucified to the world and the world is crucified to him, and finally he will also be ready to be crucified for the world. On the way of contemplation, certain attributes of Christ, the spouse, are reflected upon (here, some mss. read *susceptio Spiritus Sancti* instead of *susceptio Sponsi* which, however, does not seem very plausible in the context), which are

to awaken a strongly felt love in the person (*ad dulcorem caritatis*): a love that is alert, confident, longing, enthusiastic and joyful. This paragraph (3, 6–7) consists almost entirely of quotations from sacred scripture. When the topic is the ultimate union in love, only the word of God himself has anything at all to say.

Thus the structure of purgation, illumination and perfection is molded into the mysticism of the cross and that of the spouse.

Further Works of Mystical Theology

Besides these two short but outstanding works of mystical theology, Bonaventure's oeuvre contains a number of further pearls of this genre. They can, however, be only hypothetically dated.

In his position as minister general of the Minorites, Bonaventure was also to a certain extent responsible for the order of the Poor Clares, who during his time lived in about 400 convents. We know that Bonaventure was rather reserved on the question of pastoral care for convents of women (*cura monialium*); this was not unusual in the historical context. Since the number of monastic women was constantly increasing and most of them looked to the religious men for spiritual and sometimes also for economic assistance, all male branches of the orders—Cistercians, Premonstratensians, Dominicans and Franciscans—had since the year 1220 tried to limit their responsibilities for the women as far as possible. The care for *moniales* was especially difficult when these women strove to live "in utter poverty," i.e., without any fixed income of their own. It is known that even Francis had been surprisingly reserved with regard to the question of pastoral care for monastic women. As we know from the testament of St Clare, he took care of her convent in Assisi: "He promised always to care for us as for his own brethren and look after us personally as well as through his order" (29).[78] The *Regula bullata* ordains that only those brethren were allowed to enter a convent of women who had been authorized by the Holy See. Later, this passage was also applied by the

[78] A few years ago, Werner Maleczek questioned the authenticity of Clare's testament: *Klara von Assisi. Das 'Privilegium paupertatis' und das Testament* (Rome: 1995). Meanwhile this question has been solved and the authenticity of the text has been proved by the manuscript tradition: Niklaus Kuster, "Clare's Testament and Innocent's III Privilege of Poverty: Genuine or Clever Forgeries?," *Greyfriars Review* 15 (2001): 171–221 (orig. German, 1996); Leonhard Lehmann, "Die Echtheit des Testaments der hl. Klara. Ein Vergleich mit ihren Briefen," in *Zwischen Bettelarmut und Beziehungsreichtum. Beiträge zur neueren Klara-Forschung*, ed. Bernd Schmies (Münster: 2011).

minister general and served as a defense against demands from the continually increasing number of women's communities.

Besides, in its earlier phase, the order had not yet been sufficiently stabilized and there were not enough priests among the brethren for pastoral work. When in Italy, France, Spain and Germany, numerous convents had been organized after the example of San Damiano, these problems became obvious. The somewhat ambivalent attitude of the founder now allowed different interpretations. During Bonaventure's time in the office of superior general, the *cura monialium* began to be established. When the Cardinal Protector John Gaetano Orsini, who later was to become Pope Nicolas III, urgently begged him, Bonaventure ordained that the provincials should appoint brethren suitable for the tasks of holding visitations in the convents of *moniales* and take pastoral care of them.[79]

Personally, Bonaventure was in contact with several convents; and it is obvious that his spirituality is close to that of St Clare. While he stayed on La Verna planning his *Itinerarium*, he wrote a *Letter to the Sisters of San Damiano* reflecting the same spirit, a letter of spiritual encouragement and joy.[80] On 3 October 1260, he was present in Assisi and took part in the translation of St Clare's relics.[81] In *De perfectione vitae ad sorores* (8, 102–127), we find a kind of completion or adaptation of *Triplex via.*[82] *Perf. vit. sor*. is known by several different titles[83] and is an important example of spiritual instruction from a time when the spiritual direction of religious women was just beginning to develop. Bonaventure wrote this treatise for Isabel, sister of King Louis, who herself had founded a convent "of the Humility of Mary" in Longchamp near Paris. Isabel was well versed in Latin and did not adopt any of the rules that had already been written for "poor women"; rather, she wrote a rule of her own which was approved

---

[79] *Const. Narb*., rub. 6 (8, 456); cf. *Additamentum* (8, 467), probably from a later date (perhaps 1274). Cf. *Exp. Reg.* 11.11 (8, 435); *Epist. ad Fr. Laurentium* (23 September 1263) (8, 471–472); *Letter to the provincial of Aragon* (27 September 1263), in *Estudis Franciscans* 37 (1926): 112ff.; *Letter to the provincial of Pisa* (16 May 1272) (8, 471ab). A manuscript of this letter preserved in Pisa is considered to be an autograph by Bonaventure.

[80] *Epist.* 7 (8, 473f.).

[81] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 7.

[82] Aside from *Triplex via, Lignum vitae* and *Breviloquium*, Brady was also able to identify several of Bonaventure's sermons that were incorporated into *Perf. vit. sor.*, see "The Authenticity of Two Sermons of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 28 (1968): 4–26.

[83] Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae Scripta*, 20.14: *De forma perfectionis religiosorum; De profectu vitae religiosae; De sui ipsius cognitione; Tractatus ad sorores de humilitate*, etc.

by the pope in 1259 and then once more in 1263.[84] She also presented this rule to five professors of the Friars Minor, among them Bonaventure and William of Melitona. The name which the sisters had given themselves, *sorores minors*, shows that they strove to live according to the ideals of Francis and Clare.

Isabel had begged of Bonaventure a lecture for "edification" and he answered in the form of a letter, or rather an imagined dialogue with a sister asking him questions. This results in a very animated text similar to that of the *Soliloquium.* At first, he gives a short summary of the ideals of religious life in community. After that, he discusses the theological question of the "reward of virtue" or the essence of the gift of love. As with *Solil.*, no academic theological education is required for reading *Perf. vit. sor.* However, Bonaventure quotes several authors who at that time were widely known: Bernard, Gregory the Great, Augustine, Jerome, the *Glossa*, John Chrysostom, stories from the *Vitae partum*, Isidore of Seville, and even Aristotle. Quotations from other sources can also be found; they are, however, not named (for example, Richard of St Victor). The letter serves the purpose of educating the sisters in "devotion," which means an attitude of reverence, commitment, and trusting love towards God, which especially those persons must acquire who are dedicated to God (*homo Deo devotus*). Unlike *QD Perf. evang.*, this work is not ordered according to the evangelical counsels. The individual chapters deal with certain virtues which are indispensable for the spiritual life of a dedicated person: self-knowledge and humility (chs. 1 and 2); special weight is attached to poverty (ch. 3), then the meaning and importance of silence is discussed (ch. 4) as a means of finding the way into a dialogue with God (ch. 5). Meditating on the suffering of Christ (ch. 6) should lead to perfect love of God (ch. 7), which perseveres to the end (ch. 8).

The *Soliloquium* (8, 28–67) is a person's dialogue with himself: the "inner person" (*homo interior*) who already knows about the right way and speaks of it with the "soul" (*anima*) that is simply longing for God. *Solil.* is meant for "simple people" and does not presuppose any academic theological knowledge. However, it contains numerous quotations from the church fathers, and other theologians and different traditions come in: above all, Hugh of St Victor, who had himself composed a *Soliloquium de arrha animae*, and Augustine, whose *Soliloquia* had become famous,

[84] Isabel's rule is edited in I. Omaechevarria, *Escritos de Santa Clara* (Madrid: 1982), 293–324.

Bernard of Clairvaux: *De consideratione* 5, the ps.-Augustinian *Liber de spiritu et anima*, Jerome, Gregory and many others. Like *Brev., Solil.* starts with Eph. 3:14–19, and the scriptural passage about the "length, breadth, height and depth" serves as a foundation for the following four meditations (*quattuor mentalia exercitia*). First, the attention of the inner eye is focused on the person's interior and his dignity as one created after the image of God (*anima creata ad imaginem Dei*), the spoiling of this image by sin (*imago deformata per culpam*), and the redemption and re-creation by Christ (*imago reformata per gratiam*). The second meditation turns to the external world, whose glory is perishable (*mundus instabilis, mutabilis, miserabilis*). Thirdly, the person is led to look at the limited time of his earthly life for which he has to render account at death (*inferior*), and fourthly, his attention is focused on heaven (*superior*), where the promised joys of paradise are waiting. *Solil.* ends, like *Brev.* and *Perf. vit. sor.*, with a quotation from the *Proslogion* of Anselm of Canterbury, which Bonaventure seems to have been especially fond of:

> I pray to Thee, oh God, that I may know and love Thee so that I may also find my joy in Thee. And if I cannot fully attain to this during the time of my earthly life, so grant me at least to progress in it from day to day until I reach fullness. May my knowledge of you increase here on earth and be perfect in heaven. May my love of you grow here and be perfect there, so that my joy be great already here in hope and complete there in the perfect reality.[85]

Lignum vitae ("tree of life") belongs to an entirely different category. Obviously, the title alludes to a parallel between the "tree of life" which is the cross of Jesus and the "tree of life" in paradise. In the understanding of Bonaventure, both trees are symbols of Christ, who alone can give life to the person. The book contains 48 short meditations on the mysteries of Christ (*mysteria*), and wants to be understood as a short version of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The meditations begin with "begotten by the Father before all time" and end with the glory of the second coming of Christ as the judge and bridegroom, as John depicted him in the Apocalypse. In the chapters between these two points, the events during the earthly life of Jesus are reflected upon (in Bonaventure's time, the number of the Stations of the Cross had not yet been limited to the 14 we know today), his resurrection and his exaltation as Head of the church. By the "mysteries,"

---

[85] Quoted from *Brev.* 7.7 (5, 291): *Oro, Deus, cognoscam te, amem te, ut gaudeam de te; et si non possum ad plenum in hac vita, vel proficiam in dies, usque dum veniat illud ad plenum; proficiat hic in me notitia tui et ibi fiat plena; crescat hic amor tuus, et ibi sit plenus; ut hic gaudium meum sit in spe magnum et ibi sit in re plenum.*

we should understand salvific events in relation to *the* "mystery" itself: the Son of God incarnate and his divine-human existence. The person meditating on these "mysteries" is to encounter the Saviour in person. For this purpose, every meditation is subdivided into two parts. At first, there is a brief description of the event (e.g., the betrayal of Judas) or of the truth believed (e.g., Jesus as the judge to come), then there follows an inner answer of the person meditating, often in form of a prayer (transformation of the affect, of the desire, the will, the feelings, to compassion, contrition, or hope).

> Out of the wood of the holy gospel in which the suffering and glory of Jesus are told in detail, I endeavored to pick these "bouquets of myrrh": to ignite the heart in loving sensation, to form the mind and to impress the memory (…). Besides, while choosing the words, I was thinking of simple, ordinary people who lack higher education (…). Since the mind is aided by imagination, I ordered the few things which I had collected around a tree which the reader is to imagine. At the lower branches, where the tree just begins to branch out, the origin of the Saviour and his life should be described, in the middle part his suffering, and on the top his glorification. The first row of branches has four short verses hung from them in alphabetical order, the same in the middle and on top. A fruit is growing out of each so that there are twelve branches bearing twelve pieces of fruit according to the mystery of the tree of life (prol. 2).

Later *Lig. Vit.* became very well known, was translated into vernacular languages, and partly also expanded. The *Arbor vitae crucifixae Iesu* by Ubertino of Casale is based on *Lig. vit.* From the tradition of the manuscripts and from the passage quoted above, we can conclude that Bonaventure had added to this meditative text a drawing of a tree with the crucified Jesus. The branches and leaves optically depict the various events from the life of Jesus that are meditated upon, and the fruits symbolize the twelve attitudes and affects that are to be gained by meditating. In any case, from the beginning, the *Lignum vitae* seems to have been handed down together with a picture; obviously the script was not only "read." Bonaventure himself had already put the 48 meditations into verses of four lines each which together make up kind of a litany. This summary was meant to assist in keeping the individual mysteries of salvation in mind and meditating on them without the help of a book. Later on, this litany was handed down and edited apart from the book. The tradition of the manuscripts shows that the verses which always have a refrain were meant to be sung from very early times on, e.g., in manuscripts in Darmstadt (thirteenth century) and Berlin (fourteenth century). So we may assume that Bonaventure himself composed the music to accompany it.

The meditations *De quinque festivitatibus pueri Jesu* ("About the five feasts in the childhood of Jesus": 5, 88ff.) constitute another book which is closely related to the Christological meditations in the *Lig. vit.* It speaks about the annunciation, the birth, the name-giving, the adoration of the magi from the East, and the presentation in the temple. The person meditating is supposed to "re-live"—as Bonaventure puts it in the prologue—these feasts which are celebrated during the liturgical Christmas season. As in the *Itin.*, Bonaventure speaks briefly about the burden of his office and his longing for prayer and contemplation:

> I had for a short while withdrawn from the noise and from the many thoughts assailing me. I wanted to ponder quietly within myself how to reflect on the incarnation of God in this time so as to receive some spiritual consolation. I had the desire to taste divine sweetness in this valley of tears through the mirror of meditation in order to be more perfectly able to resist the consolations of this world which are only an illusion. Then it came to my mind in a gentle and mysterious way that a soul who trustingly loves God could by the grace of the Holy Spirit *spiritually receive* the blessed Word of the Father, his only begotten Son by the power of the Most High; that she could *spiritually give birth* to the Son of God, name him, *search for him and adore him* together with the magi and finally—full of bliss—*present him* to the Father *in the temple*, as has been ordained by the law of Moses.[86]

It had been Bonaventure's intention to present these meditations in humble words (*verbis humilibus*) and without giving any quotations (*concordantiis auctoritatum praetermissis*). Like the *Solil.* and the *Lig. vit.*, the work soon became well known and was translated into several vernacular languages.

Poetry

Bonaventure's prose and his poetry give proof of his outstanding giftedness in language and probably also in music. The *Officium passionis* (8, 152–158) was most likely created very early at the request of King Louis IX.[87]

---

[86] *Itin.*, prol. (5, 88): *quod cum me a cogitationum incidentium tumultu paululum subtraxissem et intra memetipsum tacitus cogitarem, quid de divina incarnatione in hoc tempore pertractarem in mente, unde aliquam consolationem spiritualem reciperem, in qua divinam dulcedinem in hac lacrymarum valle per speculum degustarem, ut (…) temporalem ac fantasticam consolationem perfectius fastidirem: incidit menti meae secretius, quod anima Deo devota, benedictum Dei Patris Verbum et Filium unigenitum mediante gratia Spiritus Sancti spiritualiter posset virtute Altissimi concipere, parere, nominare, cum beatis magis quaerere et adorare et demum Deo Patri secundum legem Moysi in templo feliciter praesentare.*

[87] Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae Scripta*, with whom Bougerol concurs, surmises 1242–1247.

It contains three longer hymns—for Matins, Lauds and Vespers—as well as five shorter ones for the little hours and Compline. Most probably, the *Laudismus de sancta cruce* (667–669) is an authentic work of Bonaventure. With regard to content as well as metre, the verses show parallels to the *Stabat mater*.[88] For a long time, this famous sequence—a meditation about the sufferings of Mary, the mother of God, in compassion with her crucified son, intended to arouse compassion—has been ascribed to Jacopone da Todi. In recent years, scientific research has been inclined to assume that Bonaventure is the author.[89] Another small work is called *Corona beatae Mariae virginis* (677–678) and contains meditations on the "Joys of Mary" (annunciation, birth, resurrection and ascension of Christ, as well as Mary's assumption into heaven). It constitutes an additional Marian office ("Officium parvum") with the following contents: A short hymn is followed by an antiphon obviously fashioned according to the Marian antiphons, with a psalm or a canticle; this is followed by a short meditative prayer, the "Ave Maria," and the concluding prayer.

Works of Doubtful Authenticity

During later times, numerous works were attributed to Bonaventure, among them works of mystical spirituality. Some of these *Opuscula* have also been taken up into the *Opera omnia* but nowadays, their authenticity is at least doubtful. Bougerol counts the *De Praeparatione ad missam* (8, 99–106) among Bonaventure's authentic works, whereas Brady can give good reasons why this is rather doubtful. Nor can the *Vitis mystica* as a whole likely be ascribed to Bonaventure. It is likely that these meditations are based on one of his sermons on Jn. 15:1, "I am the true vine" (*Ego sum vitis vera*), which was later expanded.

Contests During the Later Years 1266–1273

While staying in Mantes on 24 November 1265, Bonaventure received a letter from Pope Clement IV informing him of his appointment as archbishop of York. Since Bonaventure had already been in England holding a

---

[88] Cf. verse 1: *Recordare sanctae crucis/qui perfectam vitam ducis/collaetare iugiter.// Sanctae crucis recordare/et in ipsa meditare/insatiabiliter.* Verse 37: *Crucifixe fac me fortem/ ut libenter tuam mortem/plangam donec vixero.//Tecum volo vulnerari/te libenter amplexari/in cruce desidero.*

[89] See Leo Scheffczyk, "Stabat Mater," in *Marienlexikon*, ed. Leo Scheffczyk and Remigius Bäumer, vol. 6, 261–266, here 261 (St. Ottilien: 1994).

visitation, he knew the country. In spite of the approaching winter season, he immediately set out for Italy in order to meet the Pope and convince him that it was impossible for him to leave his office in the order. And the Pope, though with a heavy heart, gave him permission "to grow old in his present office."[90] The situation in the order had not yet been stabilized, and Bonaventure knew that heavy storms were brewing on the horizon.

The most important works which he wrote during this period are the *Apologia pauperum* (8, 230–330) written in the autumn of 1269, after the general chapter of Assisi (12 May 1269) and the three series of *Collationes*, which have unfortunately come down to us only as reports (*reportationes*): the *Collationes de decem praeceptis* (5, 507–529), held during the Lenten season of 1267 (6 March–17 April 1267), the *Collationes de septem donis Spiritus Sancti* (5, 457–498) from the Lenten season of the following year (25 February–7 April 1268), as well as the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* (5, 329–454). Bougerol dates the latter 23 sermons in the period between 9 April and 28 May 1273, which means they were held during the Easter season,[91] not during Lent.

Second Phase of the Mendicant Controversy

After the general chapter of Paris, at Pentecost of 1266, Bonaventure wrote a letter to each of the provincials.[92] He bitterly complains that even those responsible in the order had lost their focus on the real goal: "They spend themselves for worthless things, that is for earthly goods, and allow the holiness of the souls which are their most precious goods to perish." Here Bonaventure refers to his experiences during his numerous journeys. He had observed that the Friars Minor liked to take on tasks which by right belonged to the parish clergy, whose hatred they thus aroused. The pope had begged him already to undertake something against this malpractice. Bonaventure even speaks of brethren who in their sermons had openly given scandal by criticizing bishops and other persons in office. Here Bonaventure points to the example of St Francis who never acted like this, but rather admonished priests in private. Not only the attitude

---

[90] The bull addressed to Bonaventure: *Bullarium Franciscanum* 3 (repr. Assisi, 1984), p. 60f.

[91] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 237f.; Palémon Glorieux, "La date des 'collationes' de S. Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 22 (1929): 257–272; Jacqueline Hamesse, "La deuxième reportation des 'Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti' de saint Bonaventure," *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 19 (1977): 59–64.

[92] *Epist.* 2.

of these brethren was unlike that of St Francis; they also seemed to have quite a different understanding of the church.

One reason for the conflict between parish clergy and the mendicants lay, of course, in the fact that there was rivalry with regard to remuneration. But the situation was much more serious. The mendicant controversy had only been under cover for some time; now it had broken out anew. There were plans for a general attack against the mendicant orders, and this time its leader was Gerard of Abbeville. He used all the arguments which William of Saint-Amour had collected during the years of his exile.[93] The time was favorable for a new attack because the Holy See had become vacant and was to remain so for another two years.[94]

This time the main theme of the conflict lay in the question of the kind of *perfection* which the gospel demands. Does this necessarily include the kind of poverty practiced by the mendicants? And did not that mean a depreciation of the bishops who had earthly possessions, although according to classical ecclesiology they were "in the state of perfection"? The mendicants' opponents argued that bishops and parish priests were the successors of the apostles and the disciples whom Jesus himself had chosen; this, of course, minimized the difference between the office of bishop and the parish priests. The religious orders—so the argument of the opponents—had only appeared later in the history of the Church. Already in 1267, in a *disputatio*, Gerard had attacked those who encouraged young people to enter an order.[95]

Thomas Aquinas had come back to Paris after his years spent in Italy, and gave his answer to the opponents in a public dispute (*Quodlibet*) and in a written form in the two works *Contra retrahentes* and *De perfectione vitae spiritualis.* Bonaventure first chose the form of *Collationes*, longer evening sermons. Above all in the *Collationes de septem donis Spiritus*

---

[93] In 1257, when William refused to show any willingness for reconciliation, he was banished.

[94] Bartholomew of Pisa, *Liber conformitatum*, 8.2 (*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 4: 345), reports that the assembled cardinals could not come to an agreement and asked Bonaventure's advice. He then recommended the man who became pope under the name of Gregory X.

[95] A. Teetaert, ed., "Quatres questions inédites de Gérard de Abbeville pour la défense de la supériorité du clergé séculier," *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 1 (1951): 85–178; S. Clasen, "Die 'duplex quaestio' des Gerhard von Abbeville über den Ordenseintritt Jugendlicher," *Antonianum* 22 (1947): 177–200; P. Grand, ed. "Le Quodlibet XIV de Gérard d'Abbeville," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* (1946): 207–269; L.-J. Bataillon, "Fragments de sermons de Gérard d'Abbeville, Eudes de Rosny, et Thomas d'Aquin," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 51 (1984): 257–268.

sancti, he answered the arguments of the opponents. The "gift of science" (*donum scientiae*) enables a person to "know good and evil," i.e. "discern the spirits"—not of their own accord, like Adam and Eve in former times, but by the teaching of the gospel and by Christ's way of life described there. The "gift of counsel" (*donum consilii*) enables the person to follow the "good counselor." Bonaventure's listeners understood whom he meant by the "bad counselor": the one who distorts values, who counsels to leave what is good and great, and who sows doubt. First and foremost, the good counselor is Jesus Christ himself; others (apostles, saints) are so to the extent that they follow the example of Christ. We can also find some fine passages of Mariology in *De don. spir.*, besides Bonaventure's arguments against the mendicants' opponents.[96]

Apologia pauperum

One year later, Bonaventure was forced to answer directly the arguments presented by Gerard of Abbeville in reaction to a work of the Franciscan Thomas of York entitled *Manus qui contra Omnipotentem*. Already in the title of his script *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae et praelatorum et facultatum ecclesiae*,[97] Gerard argues that utter poverty cannot be advised or praised without at the same time attacking Christ and the practice in the church. Bonaventure answers in his "defense of the poor against those who insult and calumniate them" (*Apologia pauperum contra calumniatorem*: 8, 233–330). In twelve chapters, Bonaventure takes up each argument. At first he points to the kenosis of Christ. Then he shows that Gerard's definition of perfection as "absence of sin" leads to faulty conclusions in the discernment between perfection and imperfection. The perfection of the Christian life consists in charity,[98] which can be practiced to different degrees. *Apol. paup.* not only defends mendicant poverty, but also contains a theology of the evangelical counsels; moreover, Bonaventure speaks about the kind of perfection which lies in desiring martyrdom. Of course, voluntary poverty is given special weight: "Freely

---

[96] *De don. Spir.* 5 and 6 (479 f.; 483–489): Mary as "mulier fortis" (*donum fortitudinis*).

[97] Edition in M. Bierbaum, *Bettelorden und Weltgeistlichkeit an der Universität Paris* (Münster: 1920), 37–168. S. Clasen, ed., "Tractatus Gerardi de Abbatisvilla 'Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae'," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 31 (1938): 276–329; 32 (1939): 89–200.

[98] *Radix, forma, finis, complementum et vinculum perfectionis caritas est, ad quam magister omnium Christus Legem et Prophetas et per consequens universa Dei documenta reducit* (8, 244).

chosen poverty which demands a high degree of self-denial is fundamental to evangelical perfection."[99] Here Bonaventure makes it very clear that a person can certainly possess goods without detriment to his evangelical perfection, especially in the case of a bishop who has the duty to care for the poor. However, he calls Gerard's statement that possessions lead to perfection absurd and totally contrary to the gospel and to the counsel of Jesus.[100]

Also during the following years, hostility against the mendicants continued. At the Council of Lyon in 1274, some participants vehemently demanded that the curia should prohibit the mendicant religious orders altogether. One reason for this certainly lay in the fact that meanwhile too many different groups had been founded, some of a questionable nature. Thus the decree *Religionum diversitatem* confirms the regulation by the Fourth Lateran Council that forbade the founding of a new religious order with a new rule; moreover, it dissolved all religious communities which had meanwhile been founded without papal approbation. These, too, were clearly restricted. Dominicans and Franciscans were expressly exempted since their usefulness for the church had been proved. We have good reasons to believe that it was above all Bonaventure's personality that had achieved this success for the future of the Order of Preachers and the Friars Minor.[101]

Heterodox Aristotelianism[102]

The conflict with the mendicants' opponents was only one of the battles which Bonaventure had to fight. The other one had been initiated by a philosophical movement called "heterodox Aristotelianism." In his *Hexaëmeron* 1, 9, Bonaventure states pointedly: "Theologians attack Christ's way of life, philosophers his teaching." The poverty of Christ had been denied by members of the theological faculty, and the philosophical faculty had developed teachings that were incompatible with the Christian doctrine.

---

[99] See *Apol. paup.* 7 (8, 272–286).

[100] *Apol. paup.* 8.9 (8, 289): *Verum est quidem quod ecclesiastica praedia sine detrimento perfectionis haberi possunt; quod autem sint ad perfectionis cumulum, sentire vel dicere (. . .) absurdum est.* Ulrich Horst, *Evangelische Armut und Kirche* (Berlin: 1992), esp. 156–167; Idem, *Bischöfe und Ordensleute* (Berlin: 1999).

[101] Burkhard Roberg, *Das Zweite Konzil von Lyon* (Paderborn: 1990), 342.

[102] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 47–53: "Aristote et saint Bonaventure."

One of the factors leading to the development of scholasticism had been the reception of a great part of Aristotle's teaching. During the early medieval period, Aristotle had been appreciated mainly for his logic; but when step by step his works of natural philosophy and metaphysics became better known, philosophy emerged as a complete scientific discipline. Aristotle became known as "*the* philosopher" just as St Paul was simply named "*the* Apostle" and Peter Lombard as "*the* magister." This reception of Aristotle did not happen without difficulties, since among the works known under his name there were also works of Neo-Platonic origin. Another complication lay in the fact that many of the texts were not direct translations from the Greek, but had been translated into Latin from Arabic, and were accompanied by Arabic commentaries such as those of Avicenna (980–1037) and above all Averroes (1126–1198) who was simply called "the commentator." While at the beginning of the thirteenth century, Aristotle's treatises on natural philosophy met with a certain reservation, he had already in the 1240s an established place in the canon of books used in academic studies.[103] From 1252 onward, Aristotle's *Metaphysics* was among the books used in the arts faculty.

Bonaventure did not write a commentary on Aristotle, not only because of his short time as a magister, but also because this was not the custom in the Franciscan order until the end of the thirteenth century. Since Aristotle had already been well accepted during those years, Bonaventure was familiar with him and we notice that he quotes him more often in his later works than he had done in the *Commentary to the sentences*.[104] In one of the university sermons[105] during his time as a magister, he accredits to Aristotle "the word of science" among the philosophers, as he ascribes "the word of wisdom" to Plato (see 1 Cor. 12:8). Bonaventure voices the opinion that Plato needs complementing by Aristotle: If all insight is gained only from ideas and knowledge with the help of the senses despised, there is a danger that one falls into general scepticism—as had been the case with the academics of the Platonic school.

In epistemology, Bonaventure accordingly combines Aristotle's teaching on "abstraction" with the Augustinian teaching of "illumination." Bonaventure is convinced that neither Aristotle nor Plato, despite their many true insights, could attain to the fullness of truth; they could not find the

---

[103] Martin Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* vol. 2 (Munich: 1936), 182–199.

[104] Bougerol, *Introduction*, 47–53; Fernand Van Steenberghen, *Die Philosophie im 13. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: 1977), 212–231.

[105] *Chr. mag.*, 18 (5, 572).

truth of revelation with regard to the salvation of humankind, and are not to blame for it. Those philosophers deserve blame, however, who are Christians and yet support certain theses which are diametrically contrary to revelation. Above all, there were three questions which are connected with each other and were issues of controversy between a particular form of reception of Aristotle and the Christian faith: Aristotle's opinion that the world is eternal, that there is no providence for the individual, and that the individual human soul is not immortal. All three issues concern the concept of the human person and his power of knowledge, his freedom and responsibility and his eternal beatitude.[106]

According to Bonaventure, all these erroneous opinions have their origin in one root: the relationship between God and the world—especially: God's Word as *causa exemplaris*—is not seen in the right perspective.[107] In the face of too much enthusiasm for and uncritical reception of "the philosopher" and his "commentator" in the 1260s, Bonaventure saw it as his duty to warn against the "insolent audacity of philosophical research."[108] Even philosophy is a science with limitations, and Bonaventure reminds the members of the faculty of Arts that Aristotle himself, in his *Metaphysics*, had acknowledged the limits of human knowledge: "Our intellect can take in the most obvious existing things as little as the eye of a nocturnal bird can see the sun." He admonishes them to take Aristotle seriously in this self-restraint and not play down the supernatural light of revelation: "Philosophy is the sure knowledge of matters accessible to human investigation; theology is the loving knowledge of matters pertaining to faith."[109]

Even though there is a difference between philosophy and theology, Bonaventure regards philosophy as oriented towards theology: If philosophical knowledge is to attain to the fullness of truth, it should not be closed in upon itself. The philosopher who is not open to solutions which he cannot find on his own will fall prey to error.[110] Or, to put it the other way round: The difference between the two disciplines must not become so much of a separation that they become two entirely opposing ways of perceiving the reality of the world.

---

[106] The denial of a person's individuality, his intellect and will, is "the worst error of all"; see *De don. Spir.*, 8.16–19 (5, 497–498).

[107] *Hex.*, 6.1–6 (5, 360–361).

[108] *De dec. praec.*, 2.24 (5, 514): *improbus ausus philosophicae investigationis.*

[109] *De don. Spir.*, 4.5 (5, 474): *Scientia philosophica nihil aliud est quam veritatis ut scrutabilis notitia certa. Scientia theologica est veritatis ut credibilis notitia pia.*

[110] *De don Spir.*, 4.12 (5, 475–476).

In Bonaventure's view, the human mind can reach far. After giving a number of arguments why the eternity of this world cannot be proved, he proceeds to demonstrate that the opposite may be proven. In this he differs from Thomas Aquinas, who was also discussing the heterodox Aristotelianism. Of course, all Christian theologians agree that the world has had a beginning from God.[111] They differ, however, on the question whether this is simply a doctrine of faith, or whether it can be proved by reason. According to Thomas, neither the world's beginning nor the opposite can be proved by reason. Therefore a person can be of either opinion, as a philosopher—though not as a Christian. Bonaventure, however, says that a Christian person knows about the limitedness of the world *de facto* by divine revelation (Gen. 1:1), but that any person can *per se* arrive at this insight by means of his reason, since the contingency of all existing beings can be known already before a person knows about creation by revelation.[112]

Collationes in Hexaëmeron

These "Conferences about the Work of the Six Days of Creation" are again arguments in favor of the belief that the human reason needs to be supported by revelation in order to understand its own dignity.

The subtitle of this works reads "the seven illuminations of the Church (*illuminationes ecclesiae*)," and Bonaventure intended to draw a parallel between them and the seven days of creation. In the prologue[113] to the work, he first (col. 1) speaks about the disposition needed for hearing the word of God, and of "Christ as the center of all sciences." The following topic is the relationship between insight and wisdom (*intellectus—sapientia*), an issue which Bonaventure had discussed already in detail in *III. Sent.* d. 35. By *intellectus*, he means the insight received by grace, for which, however, human effort is needed just as well; whereas *sapentia* is infused knowledge. Gaining "insight" he compares with the baking of bread (*pane intellectus*), whereas he speaks of the infusion with "wisdom" as a simple drinking without effort (*aqua sapientiae*). Contemplation with the *intellect* is, however, the "key" to this *sapientia* (*clavis contemplationis*: col. 3).

---

[111] The relevant sources are in *Bonaventura, Thomas von Aquin, Boethius von Dacien: Über die Ewigkeit der Welt*, intro. Rolf Schönberger (Frankfurt a.M.: 2000).

[112] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 1 a. 1 (5, 49).

[113] Pietro Maranesi, *Verbum inspiratum. Chiave ermeneutica dell' Hexaemeron di San Bonaventura* (Rome: 1996).

In the chapter on the first day of creation, he speaks of the "natural light of reason" (*visio intelligentiae per naturam inditae*). The second day is compared with the "light of faith," since faith can be compared with the "vault of heaven." Here, the relationship of the creator to all creation is central. Parallels to the gifts of the third day on which the earth produces "all kinds of vegetation and plants bearing fruit" are the manifold insights that can be gained from sacred scripture. As the stars are created on the fourth day and decorate the heavens, so the insights gained in contemplation decorate the church and the individual soul, like the bride in the Song of Songs (6:9) and the woman described in the Revelation of St John (12:1). Day five stands for prophetic illumination, and day six for the insight received in the rapture of ecstasy (*raptus*).[114] The seventh day finally stands for the beatific vision in eternal glory.

Unfortunately, however, Bonaventure was unable to finish his work because he was elected cardinal bishop of Albano on 23 May and was entrusted with the preparations for the Council of Lyon, which was to be held in 1274; thus the collations end with the description of the fourth day (col. 23), and the *Hexaëmeron* has come down to us as a fragment. This is all the more deplorable because in Bonaventure's entire oeuvre, we find little about the charism of "prophecy," although this was an issue intensively disputed among theologians at that time.[115] Since the *Hexaëmeron* belongs to Bonaventure's "late works" it has met with special interest in recent research. There is still further need to investigate its relationship to his earlier works. Not only does it belong to the category of mystical and symbolical theology—in which Bonaventure here proves to be a master—but it also reflects the great challenges for theologians during that period. On the one hand, there are the tendencies within his own order to follow the ideas of Joachim, which Bonaventure counters by a Christocentric theology of salvation history; on the other hand, there are the growing differences between philosophy as it was taught at the university and theology, which necessitated a reflection on the various methods of gaining insight,

[114] *Raptus* denotes the Apostle Paul's mystical elevation as a transport "into the third heaven." Bonaventure stresses (like other scholastics) that this was not an ordinary form of ecstasy (*ecstasis, excessus mentis*) but an exceedingly rare experience of extreme rapture, similar to death, in which the ties that bind body and soul are almost entirely undone. *Raptus* is a borderline condition between life and death. Bonaventure ascribes the experience only to Paul, perhaps to Moses as well, and maybe Francis.

[115] Unless the anonymous *QD De prophetia* (Ms. Assisi 186) may be included among Bonaventure's authentic works; Marianne Schlosser, *Lucerna*, 13f.

and on their mutual dependence.[116] Research on the *Hexaëmeron* presents a number of difficulties to the interpreter: firstly, because it is incomplete, and, moreover, because it exists in two rather different reports of the work which are both unauthorized. For every interpretation, it is necessary to take into account both Reportationes.[117]

From Paris, where Bonaventure had received the papal document, he travelled to Italy and met Pope Gregory X there in September. Together they travelled to Lyon; the first official papal act there was to ordain Bonaventure bishop on 12 November 1273. We have no detailed reports about Bonaventure's activities at the Council of Lyon. The most important issues discussed there were: assistance for the Holy Land (King Louis IX had died en route to the Holy Land in 1270), union with the Eastern Church, and the inner reform of the church, above all of religious life. About two hundred years later, Pope Sixtus IV calls Bonaventure "president of the council sessions." Most probably he was responsible for leading the preparatory discourses between sessions. From the council acts, we learn that he delivered two sermons during the meeting: one at the arrival of the Greek delegation and the second during a eucharistic celebration on 29 June, in which Greek and Latin Catholics were united.

On 6 July, he was still taking part in the fourth council session, after which he fell ill. It seems that his illness was only of short duration, and on the morning of 15 July 1274, which was a Sunday, he passed away. In

---

[116] See Joseph Ratzinger, *Geschichtstheologie*; newly edited together with the previously unpublished part of the thesis: *Offenbarung und Heilsgeschichte nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura*, other essays concerning the Seraphic Doctor, and some minor articles about scholasticism, in Joseph Ratzinger, *Offenbarungsverständnis und Geschichtstheologie Bonaventuras* (Gesammelte Schriften 2) (Freiburg: 2009). The *Geschichtstheologie* has been translated by Zachary Hayes: *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: 1989). The influence of Joachim's ideas on Bonaventure remains a matter of discussion: see cf. B. McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot. Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought* (New York: 1985); Idem, "The Abbot and the Doctors: Scholastic reactions to the Radical Eschatology of Joachim of Fiore," *Church History* 40 (1971): 30–47; E.R. Daniel, "St. Bonaventure's Debt to Joachim," *Medievalia et Humanistica. Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture* N.S. 11 (1982): 61–75. Paul Zahner, *Heil in der Geschichte* (Werl: 1999); Idem, "Bonaventura, der franziskanische Joachitismus und Joachim von Fiore. Die weitere Forschung nach den Bonaventura-Studien von Joseph Ratzinger," in *Gegenwart der Offenbarung*, ed. F.-X. Heibl and M. Schlosser (Regensburg: 2011), 152–165.

[117] The *Opera omnia* (5, 329–449) include the so-called *Redactio B*; *Redactio A* was edited by Ferdinand Delorme, *Collationes in Hexaemeron et Bonaventuriana quaedam selecta* (Quaracchi: 1934). The oldest known manuscript (dating from the 13th century) was found 1984/85 in Leningrad. Originally, this manuscript was in the possession of the Sacro Convento in Assisi. But it seems that it does not hold any great surprises with regard to its contents; see Pietro Maranesi, "Bonaventura da Bagnoregio: Edizione critica della *III Collatio* dell' *Hexaemeron*," in *Editori di Quaracchi 100 anni dopo* (Rome: 1997), 149–152.

the council acts we read: "He was a man distinguished in science, excellent gift of speech and, above all, of outstanding holiness (...). He was kind, loving, pious, merciful and rich in virtues, loved by God and by people (...). At his funeral, there were many tears and deep mourning; the Lord had given him the grace that all who encountered him were filled with deep affection towards him."[118]

Reception[119]

Although he was a man of whom his teacher Alexander of Hales is reported to have said: "It seems that Adam did not sin in him," it took more than two hundred years until he was canonized by the Church.[120] Unlike the case of Thomas Aquinas, neither the memoirs of his contemporaries nor an early description of his life have come down to us. This may be due to the fact that there were no spectacular events in Bonaventure's life, as compared to the biographies of Antony of Padua and Elizabeth of Thuringia. Besides, Bonaventure was regarded not only as an individual person but as the superior of his order. During the fourteenth century, the controversies within the order itself as well as those with institutions outside took up so much energy that there was nothing left for initiating the process of Bonaventure's canonization. The spiritual party within the order was intent upon keeping up the ideal of the Franciscan beginnings—as they understood them—even under the changed circumstances; they could not see in Bonaventure the ideal follower or successor of the Poverello.

And finally there is yet a third point: unlike Thomas Aquinas who—after initial controversies—was later respected in his order as an important teacher, Bonaventure's theology was not taken up by a real "school" and carried on into the future.[121] He did have some faithful disciples, such

---

[118] The acts are printed in *Mansi* 24, 67 BC.

[119] Ildefons Vanderheyden, ed. *Bonaventura. Studien zu seiner Wirkungsgeschichte* (Werl: 1976).

[120] Lorenzo Di Fonzo, "Il processo di canonizzazione di San Bonaventura da Bagnoregio (1474–1482)," in *San Bonaventura Maestro*, vol. 1, 227–289; Stanislao da Campagnola, "Fonti e cronache francescane nei processi di canonizzazione di San Bonaventura," in *San Bonaventura Maestro*, vol. 1, 291–304.

[121] With the exception, perhaps, of the so-called "intermediate Franciscan school" that Martin Grabmann, *Geschichte der Theologie*, 68f., describes as follows: "In this Bonaventurian school, that may also be called the intermediate Franciscan school, the contradictions between Franciscan Augustinianism and Albert's, even more so Thomas's version of Aristotelianism become increasingly evident. The majority of the contradictions refer to philosophical topics (illumination theory, unity or multiplicity of substantial form, the

as Matthew of Aquasparta,[122] but with John Duns Scotus Franciscan theology and philosophy and the school based on his ideas took a different course, even though at a later time there were efforts to bring Scotus into harmony with Bonaventure.[123]

Obviously, what was accepted into tradition—also outside the Franciscan sphere—were his spiritual works which were used in pastoral ministry. Bernard McGinn states: "Bernard of Claivaux and Bonaventure (…) may be justly described as the two premier mystical teachers of the medieval West."[124] The *Triplex via* has come down to us in numerous Latin manuscripts and in translations into vernacular languages. Especially in the German- and Dutch-speaking countries, Bonaventure's works became widely known; this can "be best observed in the area of the Devotio moderna."[125] There are no less than eleven translations into Middle High German, as well as two revised versions. Translations also exist of *Lig. vit., Perf. vit. sor., Itin.*,[126] *De quin. fest.*, and parts of *Apol. paup.*, besides translations of some works which nowadays are no longer believed to be authentically Bonaventure's, such as *Regula novitiorum, Epist. continens XXV memorialia*, and numerous *spuria.*

Most of these translations—except for one translation of *Leg. maj.* from 1280—can be dated after the year 1400, so that Kurt Ruh speaks of the Bonaventure renaissance of the fifteenth century, which probably prepared the way for his canonisation in 1482. The Carthusians (e.g., Nikolaus Kempf) played an important role in the transmission of Bonaventure's spirituality.

---

compositeness of angels and human souls composed of matter and form, *rationes seminales*, etc.), but also broach dogmatic issues, since the Augustinian theory of the primacy of the will over the intellect, the contestation of a true difference between a soul's substance and a soul's faculties, etc. was of relevance to the doctrines of grace and virtue as well. Thus, in thirteenth-century manuscripts we find compilations of *loca, in quibus dissentiunt frater Bonaventura et frater Thomas*. The codification of these contradictions, *Correctorium fratris Thomae*, was composed around 1278 by Bonaventure's pupil William de la Mare (d. 1298), in which 118 doctrines of Aquinas, from his theological *Summa*, are contested."

[122] Grabmann, *Geschichte der Theologie*, 69, lists as personal pupils of Bonaventure: Walter of Bruges (d. 1307, bishop of Poitiers), Cardinal Matthew of Aquasparta (d. 1302): "His writings (…) are the purest and best expression of the philosophical-theological ideas of the Bonaventure school."

[123] Stefan Swieżanski, "Influence de Saint Bonaventure sur la pensée du XV^{e} siècle," in *San Bonaventura* 1274–1974, vol. 3, 707–723.

[124] Bernard McGinn, *The Flowering of Mysticism*, vol. 3 (New York: 1998), 87.

[125] Kurt Ruh, "Bonaventura," *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 1, 937–947, at 945.

[126] *Bonaventura, Itinerarium mentis in Deum. Nach zwei Fragmenten aus Tegernsee in altbairischer Übertragung*, ed. Werner Höver (Munich: 1970).

We also find centers of spirituality in Spain and Portugal in which Bonaventure's spiritual works were obviously intensively received.[127]

However, the situation seems to be somewhat different in the field of systematic-scientific theology. Jean Gerson (1363–1429), chancellor of the University of Paris, voiced deep regret that Bonaventure was not more widely read by students. Gerson recommends especially *Brev.* and the *Itin.*: "If you ask me I should think that among the teachers of theology Bonaventure should be the one to be recommended first. In my eyes he is—the others may excuse me—the teacher singularly suited; if you look for enlightenment of the mind and ignition of the heart you are in the best hands with him."[128] The reception of *Brev.*, however, does not seem to have been quite as scanty: the Quaracchi Edition lists 227 manuscripts for the period between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. Among the 138 manuscripts of the *Itinerarium*, 5 had their origin in the thirteenth century, 40 in the fourteenth, 91 in the fifteenth, and 2 in the sixteenth century. The centre of this reception seems to have been located in the area of Bavaria and Austria.[129] Among all of Bonaventure's works, *Brev.* and *Itin.* have been edited most frequently, *Brev.* was printed for the first time in Nuremberg in 1472. Although we do not have a translation into a popular language of this work, it is known to have been used by other authors, e.g., Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg in his influential *Compendium theologicae veritatis*, where it appears without naming Bonaventure. "Indirect reception" by quoting texts with or without naming the author must also be taken into account. During the fifteenth century, Bonaventure was known as one of the authorities of the *via antiqua*.[130]

---

[127] Isaac Vázquez Janeiro, "Libros e lectores de S. Buenaventura en España y Portugal durante la Edad Media y el Renacimiento," in *Bonaventuriana*, vol. 1, 135–175. Especially rich in works by Bonaventure was the library of the abbot of Montserrat, Garcia de Cisneros (1493–1510), as well as that of the sixteenth-century Hieronomite monastery of Guadalupe. See also Vázquez Janeiro, "Influsso bonaventuriano nella bibliografia spirituale spagnola," in *Contributi di spiritualitá bonaventuriana, Padua 15–18 sept. 1974*, vol. 2, 219–242; Idem, "San Bonaventura nella storia della spiritualità spagnola," in *San Bonaventura maestro*, vol. 3, 439–459.

[128] Jean Gerson, *De libris legendis a monacho*, n. 5f. (letter dated 9 May 1426), in Jean Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Palémon Glorieux, vol. 9 (Paris: 1973), 612f.; Gerson expresses similar sentiments in other writings: in a letter dated 7 December 1426 (ibid., vol. 2, 276–280); in *Contra curiositatem studentium* (ibid., vol. 3, 231–249).

[129] Bougerol, "L'aspect original de l' Itinerarium mentis in Deum et son influence sur la spiritualité de son temps," *Antonianum* 52 (1977): 309–325, at 321.

[130] S. Swiezanski, "Influence," 709.

In the seventeenth century, we can observe a renaissance of Bonaventure which originated principally among the Capuchins.[131] In 1588, Sixtus V declared Bonaventure a Doctor of the Church. In his bull *Triumphantis Hierusalem*, he called Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure "the two olive trees and the two candlesticks in the house of the Lord."[132] In the years 1588–1599, the works of the newly declared Doctor of the Church were edited in Rome. The Capuchins, who saw themselves as a reform movement from the roots of the order, chose Bonaventure as the ideal for their studies in the order; one reason for this can be seen in the proximity to St Francis in time and in spirituality, and certainly another reason was the intention to draw a clear line between themselves and the older branch of the Franciscan Order, which had chosen to follow the ideas of John Duns Scotus. Thus there are several textbooks *ad mentem St.i Bonaventurae* which were published in the seventeenth century.[133]

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Bonaventure was again studied with new interest. Immediately before and after the jubilee year 1874, we have a number of texts investigating individual issues in Bonaventure's theology. Already one hundred years earlier, Benoit Bonelli and Hyacinth Sbaralea had worked at an overview of Bonaventure's oeuvre. In Bonelli's "Prodromus," we have an important step towards differentiating between his authentic and non-authentic works; whereas in former editions—starting with one from the year 1495 in Strasbourg—some *spuria* had been received, while some of Bonaventure's authentic works had been rejected.[134] The edition of the Opera omnia (1882–1902) may be called the greatest achievement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as far as Bonaventure's work is concerned. In this connection,

---

131 E. Smeets, "Bonaventure (saint)," *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* 2/1, 982–986; Martin Grabmann, *Geschichte der Theologie*, 72: Officially, Alexander and Bonaventure were recognized as fathers of Franciscan theology, "even though they were later practically eclipsed by Scotus, until the Capuchins brought them back into the limelight."

132 N. 13, full text in *Acta Sanctorum* 3 July, 836.

133 *Cursus theologicus super IV libros Sententiarum ad mentem seraphici doctoris S. Bonaventurae* (Lyon: 1687). *Summa totius philosophiae ad mentem S. Bonaventurae*, (Rome: 1634–36), etc., cf. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* 2/1, 985. See also Kreszenz Braun, "Die Philosophie des Valerian Magni OFMCap (1586–1661) und die Bonaventura-Tradition des Kapuzinerordens im 17. Jahrhundert," *Rheinisch-Westfälische Kapuzinerprovinz: Familiennachrichten* 52 (1970).

134 See P. Maranesi, "L'edizione critica Bonaventuriana di Quaracchi," *Doctor Seraphicus* 49 (2002): 13–67.

the name of Fr Fidelis a Fanna (1838–1881) must above all be mentioned.[135] This new edition, as well as a recommendation of Pope Leo XIII, who did not conceal his personal appreciation of Bonaventure,[136] gave new impetus to the studies of the content. Thus, a new chapter in the reception of Bonaventure's works had begun.

[135] Fidelis a Fanna, *Ratio novae collectionis operum omnium sive editorum sive anecdotorum Seraphici ecclesiae doctoris S. Bonaventurae* (Turin: 1874). See Jacqueline Hamesse, "Évaluation critique des éditions de Quaracchi-Grottaferrata. À propos des Opera omnia de saint Bonaventure," in *Editori di Quaracchi 100 anni dopo* (1997), 41–58. See also ch. 2 of the Companion.

[136] *Is, postquam maxime arduas speculationis summitates conscendit, de mystica theologia tanta perfectione disseruit, ut de ea communi hominum peritissimorum suffragio habeatur facile princeps. Frequens libensque Nos Doctorem hunc legimus; ex qua lectione incredibili animi voluptate percellimur et fere aera levamur: ipse enim manuducit ad Deum* (10, 34).

THE OPERA OMNIA OF SAINT BONAVENTURE: HISTORY AND PRESENT SITUATION

Pietro Maranesi

The critical edition of the texts of Saint Bonaventure published at the end of the nineteenth century by the college of Franciscan Fathers of Quaracchi (a small village close to Florence) constituted the last step in a long historical process of critical work on Bonaventure's writings, which began in the sixteenth century. This important publishing event did not resolve and close every question about the texts of the great Seraphic Doctor. The nine volumes that present the complete works surely represent a point of arrival within a complex arena of work that has not definitively put up the shutters.

In this article, I wish to carry out a double purpose: first to review the principal historical stages of the process that led to the edition of Quaracchi,[1] and then to remember the successive interventions that have widened and improved the surveying work on Bonaventure's texts, pointing out issues still open.

The Opera Omnia of the Vatican Edition (1588)

The beginnings of the publishing of a collection of Bonaventure's writings are connected with two important dates linked to the acknowledgment and the proclamation to all the church of the reputation of holiness and wisdom of Bonaventure.

With his bull "Superna coelestis patria" (1482),[2] the Franciscan Pope Sixtus IV wanted to canonize Bonaventure (the fifth Franciscan saint in chronological order after Francis, Anthony, Louis of Toulouse, and Bernardine of Siena), therefore making official Bonaventure's holiness, which was already widely and long recognized and celebrated in the church. Either to take advantage of promoting the reputation of the new saint or

---

[1] In the pages that follow, I will refer to what I have already introduced in a wide historical study: P. Maranesi, "L'edizione critica bonaventuriana di Quaracchi," *Doctor Seraphicus* 49 (2002): 13–67.

[2] For the text, see. *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Quaracchi: 1882) xxxix–xliv.

for increasing it, the publication of Bonaventure's works did not delay.[3] After the first pamphlets a volume (no place given of press or date),[4] there followed from 1484 until 1504 eight printed incunabula from the main European printing offices.[5] In their totality, these first publications exclusively concentrated on Bonaventure's booklets, that is, on the short spiritual writings of the Seraphic Doctor, excluding his great theological works like the *Sentences* commentaries, the scriptural commentaries, and the sermons. Observing the increasing number of the works gathered in these editions, it would seem that there was a stratification process, which departs from a score of Bonaventurian texts (mostly spiritual) in the first editions until the seventy titles of the Venetian edition of 1504. In their order, these first publications lack logic in the way the texts were gathered. They simply seem to be containers in which some pamphlets written by the new Minorite saint were collected. This method continued into the Venetian edition of 1564, where seventy-eight titles were gathered in two volumes.

The second important date is again tied to papal action, from the Franciscan Pope Sixtus V. In 1588, he proclaimed Bonaventure Doctor of the Church, an acknowledgment that followed twenty years after the same honour for Thomas Aquinas, which was granted by the Dominican Pope Pius V. The choice to publish the complete works of the two new Doctors of the Church was a decision immediately assumed by the respective orders. The edition work of the seventeen volumes of Thomas' Complete Works[6] began in 1570, while the first volume of Bonaventure's

---

[3] For this information, see B. Monelli, *Prodromus ad opera omnia S. Bonavanturae (…) agens de eius vita, doctrina, et scriptis editis ac ineditis. Recensque inter vetustos Codices Manuscriptos inventis in libros octo tributus* (1772), 279–301.

[4] See *Opuscolorum S. Bonaventurae*, in Monelli, *Prodromus*, tabula I, 280, 281.

[5] 1) *Tractatum S. Bonaventurae*, 15 pamphlets (no place given: 1484), ibid., 281–282; 2) *Librorum et Tractatum S. Bonaventurae*: 23 pamphlets (Cologne: 1486), ibid., 282–283; 3) *Librorum et tractatum, una cum Oratione in Vita et Miracula S. Bonaventurae*: 22 pamphlets in addition to the life and miracles (Strasbourg: 1489), ibid., 283–284; 4) *Parvorum Opuscolorum*: 72 pamphlets divided into two parts (Strasbourg: 1495), ibid., 284–289: 5) *Opuscolorum*: 10 pamphlets (Brixen: 1495), ibid., 289–291; 6) *Opuscolorum, una cum Oratione Octaviani de Martinis*: 7 pamphlets (Brixen: 1497), ibid., 291–292; 7) *Opuscolorum*, 11 pamphlets (Paris: 1499), ibid., 292; 8) *Opuscolorum*: 75 pamphlets divided into two parts (Venice: 1504), ibid., 292–294.

[6] *Divi Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum opera omnia gratis privilegiisque Pii V. Pont. Max. typis excusa* (Rome: 1570), known as the *Edizione Piana*. For a survey of the successive history of the Complete Works of Thomas, see L.-J. Bataillon, "The editions of *Opera omnia* edited by the scholastics and the edition *Leonina*", in *Gli studi di filosofia medievale fra Otto e Novecento. Contributo a un bilancio storiografico.*

Complete Works[7] saw the light in 1588, and was completed in 1596 with the publication of the seventh and final volume. It seems that the arrangement of Bonaventure's writings in the seven volumes falls into two parts, distinguishing between his texts and pamphlets.

The first five volumes were dedicated to the first group, namely the longer texts, gathered for the first time: the wide-ranging and demanding exegetical works (vols. 1–2), sermons (vol. 3), and theological writings (vols. 4–5). The more exacting task was certainly the exegetical writings, not only because until then few exegetical works had been printed,[8] but also because it had to be established which commentaries were by Bonaventure,[9] a search that led to the publication of ten exegetical texts. For the other two groups of works, the organization was easier, because in the third volume were collected the three series of sermons, and in the fourth and fifth the *Commentarius in quatuor libros Sententiarum*, texts already printed.[10] In the second group, the pamphlets (vols. 6–7), a new order was given to the work of the two editors in the two volumes printed in Venice in 1565, an important point of reference.

The seven volumes contained altogether ninety-four works attributed to Bonaventure. It is clear that the implicit criterion adopted in the Vatican compilation of the *Opera Omnia* was simply and solely to re-unite and order all that already circulated through printed books or manuscripts attributed to Bonaventure, and to publish in one collection the wisdom and the holiness of the Seraphic Doctor. Two other editions followed: the first in 1609 in Mainz, and the second in 1678 in Lyon; in both cases, the seven volumes of the Roman edition were integrally printed, with no significant changes.

Atti del convegno internazionale Roma 21–23 settembre 1989 (Storia e letteratura. Raccolta di studi e testi) 179 (Rome: 1991), 141–154.

[7] *Sancti Bonaventurae ex ordine Minorum S.R.E. Episcopi Card. Albanen. Eximii Ecclesiae doctoris Opera Sixti V. Pont. Max. iussu diligentissime emendata, libris eius multis undique conquisitis aucta* (Rome: 1588).

[8] The *Expositio in Evangelium Lucae* was published by the Venetian printer Francesco Salviano, and then in 1574, in the same volume: *Expositio in librum Sapientiae* and *Expositio in Lamentationes Jeremiae*.

[9] Vol. 1: *Principium Sacrae Scripturae; Illuminationes Ecclesiae, seu expositio in Hexaëmeron; Expositio in psalterium; Expositio in Ecclesiasten; Expositio in Sapientiam; Expositio in Lamentationes Hieremiae prophetae*; vol. 2: *Expositio in cap. VI s. Matthaei; In Evangelium Lucae; In Ioannem; Collationes in Ioannem*.

[10] A first edition of the *Commentaria in libros Sententiarum* was published in 1477, in Treviso and in the same year in Venice. The publication of the *Sermones* goes back to 1479.

Venetian Edition and the Debates of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

The critical debate about the authenticity of the Bonaventure's texts was opened by the friar Luke Wadding, who critically examined the Complete Vatican Works of 1655 in its catalogue, which was dedicated to the Franciscan writer. For the first time, methodological criteria were proposed for tackling the critical questions, including the use of the manuscripts. Luke Wadding's death in 1657 prevented the realization of his plan to review the Complete Works.

For more than seventy years, the critical issue was not raised again, until 1722, when Casimiro Oudino, a Benedictine monk who later became a Protestant, published the *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiastics*[11] where, with a strong critical sense, he re-examines and contests the wide attribution of works made either to Thomas or to Bonaventure in the respective Vatican editions.[12] He also adds what today we call "internal criticism" to the criterion of the received tradition, and uses it to establish the authenticity of the texts, to see whether the language and the content of the various works contained in the edition are in agreement with the style and the thought of Bonaventure. The critical method proposed by Oudino became in his hands an axe applied to the dense forest of Bonaventurian texts. According to Oudino, only twenty-nine of the ninety-four Vatican works were certainly by Bonaventure. He considered four probable, while of the others, nine had to be considered dubious, three uncertain, and forty-nine inauthentic.

Under the critical pressure of Oudino in 1751, two Observant friars sent to press in Venice yet another *Opera omnia*, where they resume and apply the two criteria of analysis proposed by Oudino: on one hand the tradition, not only printed but also handwritten, on the other, the internal criticism of the texts. But in the edition, one can notice a difference between the programmatic intentions and the effective realizations. In particular, the manuscripts which were used are insufficient, and not always employed in a critical way. In any case, the work led to a remarkable

---

[11] Casimiri Oudini, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus ecclesiae antiquis illorumque scriptis tam impressis quam manuscriptis adhuc extantibus in celebrioribus Europae bibliothecis a Bellarmino, Possevino, Philippo Labbeo, Guilelmo Caveo, Ludovico Elia du Pin et aliis omissis, ad annum MCCCCLX vel ad artem typographicam inventam cum multis dissertationibus, in quibus insignorum autorum opuscula atque alia argumenta notabiliora accurate et prolixe examinantur*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: 1722).

[12] The two authors are discussed in the third volume, in cols. 254–373 and 373–441.

reorganization of the attributions of Bonaventure's authentic works and inserted an enormous number of supposed texts. The thirteen volumes of the edition fall into three groups: vols. 1–5 *continens opera vera et legitima* (twenty-nine Bonaventurian works), vol. 6 *continens opera dubia atque incerta* (fifteen titles), vols. 7–13 *continens opera supposititia atque illegittima* (forty-six titles).

A critical proposal was put forward in 1762 by the Conventual friar Giovanni Giacinto Sbaraglia, who used the criteria already employed by the Venetian edition to make a proposal for a possible new edition: forty-eight texts are acknowledged as authentic, eight texts are dubious, and the remaining thirty-five spurious or false; he also adds a fourth section, *De amissis et in editione vatican omissis*, presenting twenty-one pamphlets.

The last author who took up the challenge of the Bonaventurian issue was the Reformed friar Benedict Bonelli, who in 1772 published the *Prodromus ad opera omnia S. Bonaventurae*. With the 775 pages of the text in folio, the author meant to offer an instrument capable of confronting in a profitable and resolute way the plan of a new critical edition of Bonaventure's texts. It is important in this context to note that in bk. 4, entitled *Canones pro rite formando iudicio circa eadem scripta Sancti Bonaventurae*, twenty-four hermeneutic principles are presented. If these had been applied, the application of which, the difficulties Oudino had run into would have been avoided, and the authorship of several texts he had denied would have been re-established.

When we read his proposal, we can affirm that with this author, the methodological problem of the critical study of Bonaventure's texts reaches its maturity. Bonelli, in particular, not only adds complexity to the scheme of interpretation, but also establishes a synchronous and cross-referential use of the different approaches, where the manuscripts play a role for the first time. The Franciscan scholar reached these results by distinguishing the works in four groups: *De veris seu verisimilioribus*, where he lists seventy-two works; *De incertis et dubiis*, to which belong six works and some sermons; *De suppositiis*, with twenty-eight titles; the last part is dedicated to *De ineditis*, to the twenty texts that were not included in the Vatican edition, but should be considered authentic.

The conclusion to be drawn from this critical debate must bear in mind a general fact: the number of the works on which all scholars agree is less than those on which they dissent. The critical instruments which were adopted did not allow convergent conclusions. Internal criticism, if not supported by a sure historical critic with a wide acquaintance with the theological and philosophical context in which Bonaventure lived, could

not reach unanimous conclusions. In particular, in their work, they lacked the decisive contribution of the manuscripts, of the witnesses, which could take us back as close as possible to the author himself. The examination of the greater number of codices and the reconstruction of their relationships offer an objective, even if not absolute, answer about the authorship of the various pamphlets.

Fedele da Fanna and the Edition of Quaracchi at the End of the Nineteenth Century

In spite of the issues raised about the authenticity of the Bonaventurian texts during the previous century, Adolph Carl published in Paris a new fifteen-volume edition of Bonaventure's *Opera Omnia* in 1864. The editor does not want to undertake a critical review of the texts, but simply to resume the order given to them in the Venetian edition, adding to the opening of each text the critical discussion that had been proposed by Bonelli in his *Prodromus*.

A new and decisive step forward in favour of a true critical analysis of the Bonaventurian texts, by means of a systematic employment of the manuscripts, was desired. This was carried out by the Reformed friar Fedele da Fanna. In 1870, he was charged by his minister general, Bernardino da Portogruaro, to prepare a new edition of the Complete Works of Bonaventure. The search, which was carried out by Fr. Fedele in more than five hundred European libraries, where he consulted thousands of codices, led to the discovery of a very large number of new codices and the discovery of Bonaventurian works unknown hitherto, such as *De scientia Christi* and *De mysterio Trinitatis*.

The immense new and important material which was discovered allowed Fr. Fedele to organize a serious plan of textual criticism based on the manuscripts. A text of great importance to comprehend the working method is a 320-page volume published in 1874, in which the Reformed Franciscan scholar exposes the *ratio* of his enterprise, that is, the method that he would follow for the edition.[13] The reasons that rendered necessary

[13] Fedele da Fanna, *Ratio novae collectionis operum omnium sive editorum anecdotorum Seraphici eccl. Doctoris S. Bonaventurae proxime in lucem edendae manuscriptorum bibliothecis totius Europae perlustratis mandante rev. P. Bernardino a Portu Romatino* (Turin: 1874).

a new critical examination of the Bonaventurian texts are various. In the first place, there was the accentuation in previous editions of the spiritual works of the saint. These did not accent the splendor of his scholastic theological thought, and so it was necessary to overcome the scandalous disparity of critical opinion, attributed to the critical editions of the various works of Bonaventure.[14]

There were all the presuppositions for a good and scientific critical edition. The research work on the manuscripts was already producing results, and added to this was the planning of a precise working method with clear critical objectives. What yet remained to be done, therefore, was to arrange and expand the search, creating a stable group of collaborators. The requirement to found a college of friars was realized in 1877 with the purchase of a villa in Quaracchi, a small village close to Florence, where a community of Reformed friars settled.[15] Fr. Fedele and in particular Fr. Jeiler[16] established the publishing criteria, not without difficulties of agreement. The first volume of the edition was published in 1882. It finished in 1902, with the publication of the ninth and last volume.

The critical results achieved by the edition are schematically introduced in a prospectus which details the contents of the nine volumes and the innovations in comparison with the previous lists of the works considered authentic.

Edition of Quaracchi	Vatican Ed.	Oudino	Venetian Ed.	Sbaraglia	Bonelli
Theological Texts: vols. 1–4					
In I–IV libros Sententiarum	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic

[14] See ibid., 47.

[15] About the history of Quaracchi, see C. Schmitt, "Le Collège Saint Bonaventure de 1877 à 1977," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 70 (1977): 247–306, esp. 251–258; see also the lengthy account by G. Buffon, *Il tempo di Bernardino da Portogruaro* (Assisi: 1997), 710–721.

[16] See I. Brady, "The *Opera omnia* of saint Bonaventura," *Archivum Fanciscanum Historicum* 70 (1977): 361–366, and Buffon, *Il tempo*, 723–730.

Theological Pamphlets: vol. 5

De scientia Christi	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
De mysterio Trinitatis	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
De perfectione evangelica	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Breviloquium	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Itinerarium	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
De reductione artium ad theologiam	Authentic	Dubious	Dubious	Authentic	Authentic
Collationes in Hexaëmeron	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic
De septem donis Spiritus sancti	Unknown	Spurious	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious
De decem praeceptis	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
Sermones de rebus theologicis	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
– *De Trinitate*	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited
– *De regno Dei*	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited
– *De corpore Christi*	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
– *Christus unus omnium magister*	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited
– *De plantatione paradisi*					

Nine Theological Pamphlets added to the Vatican Edition: *Centiloquium; Pharetra; Declaratio terminorum theologiae; Compendiosum principium in Libros Sententiarum; Sententiae sententiarum carmine digestae; De quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus; De resurrectione a peccato ad gratiam; De tribus ternariis peccatorum infamibus; Dieta Salutis.*

Exegetical Works: vols. 6–7

Commentarius in librum Ecclesiastae	Authentic	Authentic	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
Comm. in librum Sapientiae	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Comm. in Evangelium Ioannis	Authentic	Spurious	Dubious	Spurious	Spurious

Table (*cont.*)

Collationes in Evangelium Ioannis	Authentic	Spurious	Dubious	Spurious	Spurious
Comm. in Evangelium Lucae	Authentic	Authentic	Dubious	Authentic	Authentic
Expositio in Lamentationes	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Expositio orationis dominicae	Authentic	Authentic	Dubious	Authentic	Authentic

Three exegetic texts were added to the Vatican Edition: *Principium S. Scripturae; Expositio in Psalterium; Expositio in Psal. 118.*

Ascetic Pamphlets: vol. 8

De triplici via	Authentic	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Soliloquium	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Lignum vitae	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
De quinque festivitatibus pueri Iesu	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic
Tract. De praeparatione ad Missam	Authentic	Uncertain	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
De perfectione vitae ad Sorores	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
De regimine animae	Authentic	Uncertain	Dubious	Authentic	Authentic
De sex alis seraphim	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Officium de passione Domini	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
Vitis mystica	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited

Twenty-four ascetic pamphlets were added to the Vatican Edition: *Meditationes vitae Christi; Opus contemplationis; De septem verbis Domini in cruce; Speculum B.M. Virginis; Officium de compassione B.M. Virginis; Corona B.M. Virginis; Carmina super canticum Salve Regina; Laus B.V. Mariae; Psalterium minus B.M. Virginis; Psalterium maius B.M.Virginis; Formula aurea de gradibus virtutum; De pugna spirituali; Speculum animae; Confessionale;*

De instructione sacerdotis ad se preparandum; Expositio missae; Collatio de contemptu saeculi; De septem gradibus contemplationis; Exercitia quaedam spiritualia; Fascicularii; De septem Itineribus aeternitatis; Stimulus amoris; Amatorium; De ecclesiastica hierarchia.

Franciscan Pamphlets: vol. 8

Apologia pauperum	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Epistola de tribus quaestionibus	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Determinationes questionum	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Quare fratres minores praedicent	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Epistola de sandaliis apostolorum	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Expositio super Regulam	Authentic	Authentic	Dubious	Authentic	Authentic
Sermo super regulam	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Constitutiones narbonenses	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Epistolae officiales	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Regula novitiorum	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
Epistola continens XXV memorialia	Authentic	Authentic	Uncertain	Authentic	Authentic
Epistola de imitatione Christi	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited
Legenda maior s. Francisci	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic	Authentic
Legenda minor	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited

Ten Franciscan pamphlets are added to the Vatican Edition: *Biblia pauperum; Alphabetum religiosorum; Alphabetum religiosorum incipientium; Collationes Octo; Speculum disciplinae ad novitios; De profectu religiosorum lib. I; De profectu religiosorum lib. II; De institutione novitiorum; Regula novitiorum; Remedium defectuum religiosi.*

Dubious Pamphlets: vol. 8

Speculum disciplinae	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic
Speculum conscientiae	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
Summa de gradibus virtutum	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Possible
Collatio de contemptu saeculi	Authentic	Possible	Dubious	Authentic	Authentic
Compendium de virtute humilitatis	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Edited
Epistola ad quendam novitium	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Rhythmica					
– *Laudismus de s. Cruce*	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
– *Philomena*	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Spurious	Possible
– *De septem verbis D. in cruce*	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
– *Planctus de passione Domini*	Authentic	Spurious	Spurious	Authentic	Authentic
– *Corona B. Mariae Virginis*					

Five Dubious pamphlets are added to the Vatican Edition: *Summa de essentia, et invisibilitate et immensitate Dei; Compendium theolgicae veritatis; De sex alis Cherubim; De modo confitendi et de puritate conscientiae; Mystica theologia.*

Homiletic Works: vol. 9

Sermones de tempore	Authentic	Dubious	Spurious	Not all Authentic	Not all Authentic
Sermones de sanctis	Authentic	Dubious	Spurious	Not all Authentic	Not all Authentic
Sermones de B. Virgine Maria					
Sermones de diversis					

This material invites several comments. The first and most obvious one is the great reduction in the number of Bonaventure's works: the titles

were reduced from ninety-five to fifty, excluding the seven dubious works inserted at the end of the eighth volume. A summarized examination of several particularities in the nine volumes of the last Complete Works, compared with the previous critical judgements, allows a better estimation of the innovations of the revision carried out by this last edition.

As regards the attribution to Bonaventure of the *Commentaria sententiarum*, it is necessary to record a constant and general agreement among the scholars through the centuries. The sole innovation of the edition of Quaracchi in comparison with the Venetian edition is the positioning of the four books at the beginning of the publication, in vols. 1–4, as had happened in the Venetian edition.

But there are important innovations in vol. 5, regarding the theological pamphlets. Let us start from the eliminated ones, to which long pages of explanations are dedicated in the Prolegomena.[17] Among the six pamphlets which were considered spurious, the exclusion of the *Centiloquium* and the *De ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, previously judged authentic, was notable. The elimination of the remaining four treatises,[18] upon which there was no agreement among the scholars of the previous century, was easier. The critical work of the edition of Quaracchi not only eliminated inauthentic texts, but also added a certain number of theological pamphlets, recovered by the editors in the manuscripts or published for the first time by Bonelli in his *Supplementum*. Among the new texts, one must emphasize in particular the two above-mentioned disputed issues, *De scientia Christi* and *De mysterio Trinitatis*, to which is added an interesting series of five *Sermones de rebus theologicis*, three of which had been already published by Bonelli.

The exegetical texts too, re-united in the sixth and seventh volumes, are not free from a careful critical reflection. To the drastic reduction of the biblical commentaries attributed to Bonaventure by the Venetian edition, which had recognized only two sure titles (*Expositio in Sapientiam* and *Expositio in Lamentationes*), the edition of Quaracchi resumes the authenticity of a wide number proposed either by Oudino or Sbaraglia and Bonelli. A great innovation is here represented by the Quaracchi editors in the upsetting of a negative opinion which all the previous reviewers, along

---

[17] See *Opera Omnia*, 5, xlvii–lii.

[18] *De quator virtutibus cardinalibus; Declaratio terminorum theologiae; Sermones triginta duo de Eucaristia; De studio divinarum litterarum.*

with the Venetian edition, had given with regard to the two works which were dedicated to the Gospel of John (*Expositio* and the *Collationes*).

The other works to which the friars at Quaracchi dedicated an ample critical study were the spiritual and Franciscan pamphlets re-united in vol. 8. When we examine the similarities and the diversity between the last edition and what had been asserted by the scholars of the previous century, we can say that there was a substantial continuity with respect to the texts concerning the Minorite order, and a considerable diversification on the spiritual texts. Beginning with the texts on the order, there was much agreement among critics and the previous editors. The examination carried out by the friars at Quaracchi not only confirms conclusion about the authenticity of a large number of the treatises, but also extends the material, adding texts which were known previously, but not included in previous editions, for example, the *Sermo super Regulam*, the *Constitutiones Narbonenses, Epistolae ad imitationem Christi* and the *Legenda minor*.

In contrast to the substantial confirmation of the texts concerning the Minorite order, one notes a different situation in regard to the spiritual pamphlets. On these texts, positions have been diverse through the centuries. As a matter of fact, the thirty-seven works listed by the Vatican edition in the second and third part of the last two volumes passed to four titles, recognized by mutual consent by the scholars of the eighteenth century. The critical work carried out in Quaracchi on the spiritual pamphlets has two characteristics. The first and the most important represented by the critical analysis is that ten spiritual works are considered to be authentic. In relationship to the critical choices found in the edition, it seems to me opportune to stress two innovations: above all, the exclusion of the pamphlet *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, which was previously considered Bonaventurian by all scholars, then the addition of *Vitis Mystica*, a text which was published for the first time by Bonelli. The second innovation is much more limited and concerns a block of seven pamphlets inserted in the appendix of the eighth volume, which, though considered dubious by the editors, belong in some way to the Bonaventurian texts, because they were composed by Minorite authors who had reworked and employed Bonaventure's spiritual works.

If one wants to summarize the results achieved in the proposal of the edition of Quaracchi with regard to the three series of pamphlets, the theological, spiritual and the ones for the Order, it can be said that there was an increase of theological pamphlets, a considerable reduction of

the spiritual writings, and a substantial numerical confirmation of the writings for the order. In practice, it seems Fr. Fedele's desire was realized: to re-equilibrate the relationship between theological and spiritual works, in order to point out the speculative dimension of Bonaventure's way of thinking.

The Works in Progress in the Twentieth Century and Open Issues

One hundred years after the completion of Quaracchi's complete works, one can ask if it is necessary to get down to producing a new edition, or if the text is still valid and sufficient to know which of the texts were written by the Seraphic Doctor. In the last few decades, various authors have raised the issue about the *status quaestionis*. An important moment in this critical revisiting was the seventh centenary of the death of Bonaventure, celebrated in 1974. We particularly remember two works. The first, not only in order of time but also of importance in the systematic analysis of all texts attributed to Bonaventure, is that one of Distelbrinck, which determines the authenticity of eighty-two works, while the rest of the one hundred and eighty-three which were examined are inserted between the dubious and the spurious ones.[19] The studies by Ignatius Brady, who in various occasions returns to aspects of the problems connected with Bonaventure's work,[20] add to the current analysis. J.G. Bougerol too examines on several occasions questions concerning the authenticity of Bonaventure's works,[21] particularly on the issue of the sermons.[22] The last scholar to be mentioned here is F. Chavero Blanco. He examines the various blocks of Bonaventure's works in accordance with their presence in the Complete Works, to take up the issues that remain open and to determine which

[19] B. Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae scripta authentica, dubia vel spuria critice recensita* (Subsidia scientifica franciscalia) 5 (Rome: 1975), 387 and 912–913.

[20] Brady, "The writings of Saint Bonaventura regarding the Franciscan Order" *Miscellanea Francescana* 75 (1975): 105– 112, also in *San Bonaventura maestro di vita francescana e di sapienza cristiana. Atti del Congresso internazionale 1974*, vol. 1 (Rome), 105–112. This material is newly considered and extended in his article "The editino of the *Opera omnia* of Saint Bonaventura (1882–1902)", in *Il collegio S. Bonaventura di Quaracchi* (Grottaferrata: 1977), 116–40.

[21] His position is summarized in his *Introduzione a S. Bonaventura* (Vicenza: 1988).

[22] J.G. Bougerol, "Pour des Prolegomena Postquam de l'édition critique de S. Bonaventure Quaracchi 1882–1902," in M. Aszatolos, *The Editing of Theological and Philosophical Texts from the Middle Ages* (Stockholm: 1986), 121–135.

works should feature in the critical debate about Bonaventure's writings.[23] It seems to me helpful to re-unite the various critical issues according to four contexts of the works. Considerations of space mean that I will quote Bonaventure's titles with very short comment notes.

New Edited Texts

Absent texts in the *Opera omnia*, edited and attributed to Bonaventure:

Collationes in Hexaemeron[24]
Epistola ad decanum et canonicos Werdenses[25]
Epistola ad Fratrem Ministrum Aragoniae[26]
Epistola ad Guidonem comitem Flandriae et Matildem uxorem eius[27]
Epistola ad Ministrum et Fratres congregationis beatae Virginis in civitate Brixiensi[28]
Epistola ad Recommandatos beatae Virginis in urbe Roma[29]
Epistola de concordia cum capitulo sanctae Mariae cameracensis stabilienda[30]
Epistola de tribus quaestionibus[31]

---

[23] F. Chavero Blanco, "El catálogo de las obras de san Buenaventura. Estado actual de la cuestión," *Carthaginensis* 43 (1998): 42–100.

[24] Ed. by F. Delorme: S. Bonaventurae, *Collationes in Hexaëmeron, et Bonaventurae quaedam selecta* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica medii aevi) 8 (Quaracchi: 1934), 1–275. There was universal consensus on the attribution.

[25] Ed.: M. Bihl, "Duae confraternitatis epistolae canonicis Werdensibus a Ministris generalibus Fr. Bonaventura an. 1269 et Fr. Bonagratia an 1282 datae," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 26 (1933): 232–233; the authenticity of the text is also confirmed by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 36–37.

[26] Ed.: A. De Saldes, "Notes i documents Franciscans," *Estudis Franciscans* 37 (1926): 112–114; considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 39.

[27] Ed.: A. Callebaut, "Lettres franciscaines concernant la Belgique et la France aux XIII^{e}–XV^{e} siècle," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 7 (1914): 250–251, considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 39–40.

[28] Ed.: P. Guerrini, "Gli statuti di un'antica Congregazione francescana", in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 1 (1908): 231–233, considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 40.

[29] I.M. Pou y Martí, "Litterae confraternitatis a S. Bonaventura societati recommendatorum B.M.V. Romae concessae, a. 1268", in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 17 (1924): 451–452; considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventuare*, 42.

[30] Ed.: A. Callebaut, "Lettres franciscaines concernant la Belgique et la France aux XIII^{e}–XV^{e} siècles," in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 7 (1914): 251–254; considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 39–40.

[31] A text which represents a previous editing to that published by the edition of Quaracchi was published by F. Delorme, "Lettre de S. Bonaventure innominato magistro," in *Arichivio italiano per la storia della pietà* 1 (1951): 212–218, cf. either the notations of Blanco or the recent work of L. Pellegrini, "L'Epistola de tribus quaestionibus di Bonaventura:

Proemium in I Sententiarum[32]
Praelocutio ad proemum in II Sententiarum[33]
Responsio ad obiecta contra quamdam distinctionem in divinis[34]
Rubricae datae in Capitulo generali Pisano[35]
Sermo de s. Antonio Patavino[36]
Sermo de S. Thoma apostolo[37]
Sermo in Coena Domini[38]
Sermo in Parasceve (Michi autem)[39]
Sermo in Parasceve (Vidi et ecce)[40]

New Texts to Edit

Texts attributed to Bonaventure but still to be edited:

Collationes de donis Spiritus sancti (Reportatio brevis)[41]
Quaestiones disputatae de productione rerum, de imagine Dei et anima humana[42]
Quaestiones disputatae variae (Vaticanae)[43]

---

testo, contesto e fasi redazionali," in *Europa und die Welt in der Geschichte. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Dieter Berg*, ed. R. Averkorn, W. Eberhard, R. Haas und B. Schies (Bochum: 2004), 65–93.

[32] *Hex.* (5, 279–283).

[33] *Hex.* (5, 357–362).

[34] *Hex.* (5, 284–294).

[35] Ed.: P. van Dijk, "The statutes of the general Chapter of Pisa," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 45 (1952); 314–322; authenticity also confirmed by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 53.

[36] Ed.: M.A. Locatelli, *In Laudem thaumaturgi Antonii Patavini sermo ex mss et collectaneo Antonianae Bibliothecae codice nunc primum editus et Seraphico Ecclesiae Doctori Sancto Bonaventurae criticis ac litteraris argumentis vindicatus* (Padua: 1883), 13–15; authentic for Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 82.

[37] Ed.: G. Abate, *Un sermone sulle cinque piaghe di Gesù attribuito a San Bonaventura*, in *Miscellanea Melchor de Pobladura*, vol. 1, (Rome: 1964), 163–171; authentic for Distelbrink, 83.

[38] Ed.: F. Delorme, *Joannis de Pecham archiepiscopi Cantuariensis Quodlibet Romanum* (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani) 1 (Rome: 1938), 137–152, also in *Opera theologica selecta*, 5, 327–339; authentic for Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 85.

[39] Ed.: V. Gamboso, "I sermoni 'Erat autem' e 'Michi autem' attribuiti a S. Bonaventura," *Il Santo* 10 (1970): 150–160; authentic for Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 86.

[40] Ed.: F. Delorme, *Joannis de Pecham*, 152–172, also in *Opera theologica selecta* (Quaracchi: 1964) 5, 339–355.

[41] Authentic for Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 55–56; Bonelli's old edition, *Supplementum* III, 418–494, needs a new edition.

[42] It is a text still unpublished, considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventura*, 12.

[43] It is a text still unpublished, considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventura*, 13–4.

Texts Critically re-Edited

Texts present in the *Opera omnia* which have received a new critical edition.

Christus unus omnium magister[44]
Constitutiones generales narbonenses[45]
De regno Dei descripto in parabolis evangelicis[46]
De triplici testimonio sanctissimae Trinitatis[47]
Explanationes Constitutionum generalium Narbonensis[48]
Sermones dominicales[49]
Sermones de tempore[50]
Sermones de diversis et de sanctis[51]

Texts to be re-Edited

Texts of the *Opera omnia* which would be newly critically edited:

Collationes in Hexaemeron[52]

---

[44] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 567–574; ed.: R. Russo, *La metodologia del sapere nel sermone di S. Bonaventura "unus est Magister vester Christus"* (Grottaferrata: 1982), 98–133 and also Saint Bonaventure, *Le Christ maître. Sermon universitaire "Unus est magister vester,"* ed. Goulven Madec (Paris: 1990).

[45] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 449–464; critical ed. by C. Cenci and R. Mailleux: *Constitutiones generales ordinis fratrum minorum*, vol. 1 (*Saeculum XIII*) (Analecta Franciscana) 13 (Grottaferrata: 2007), 67–103.

[46] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 539–553; Ed.: J.G. Bougerol, "Le sermon de saint Bonaventure sur le Royaume de Dieu," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 55 (1988): 187–254.

[47] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 539–553; Ed.: Saint Bonaventure, *Sermons de diversis*, Sermon 27, I, ed. J.G. Bougerol (Paris: 1993), 360–371.

[48] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 450–455, partially printed; totally edited by F. Delorme, "Explanationes Constitutionum generalium Narbonensis," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 18 (1925): 514–524.

[49] Ed. Quaracchi, 9; Ed.: Sancti Bonaventura, *Sermones Dominicales*, ed. J.G. Bougerol (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii aevi) 26 (Grottaferrata: 1977).

[50] Ed. Quaracchi, 9; Saint Bonaventure, *Sermons de tempore. Reportations du manuscrit Milan, Ambrosienne A 11 sup.*, ed. J.G. Bougerol (Paris: 1990).

[51] Ed. Quaracchi, 9; Saint Bonaventure, *Sermons "De diversis,"* ed. J.G. Bougerol. Vol. 1: *Sermons pour les dimanches*, vol. 2: *Sermons pour les fêtes des saints* (Paris: 1993).

[52] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 327–449. I have dealt with the question of a new edition of the text, owing to the discovery in 1984 in Leningrad of the oldest manuscript, once present in the library in Assisi, of the text edited by Quaracchi. After a critical inquiry carried out on the third collation, I deduced the uselessness of this long and laborious editorial operation (P. Maranesi, "Bonaventura of Bagnoregio. A Transcription of the Collatio III

Officium de passione Domini[53]
Quaestiones de perfectione evangelica, in particular *Quaestio de mendicitate*[54]

Uncertain or Spurious Texts

Texts present in the *Opera omnia* to be considered inauthentic:

Ars concionandi[55]
De sanctissimo corpore Christi[56]
De septem gradibus proficiendi in amorem Dei[57]
De septem verbis Domini in Cruce[58]
De sex alis Cherubim (Quod multum)[59]
De sex alis Seraphim[60]

---

of Hexaëmeron", *Franciscan studies* 53 [1993]: 47–78), a supposition that I confirmed in a note in my *Verbum inspiratum: Chiave ermeneutica dell'Hexaëmeron di San Bonaventura* (Bibliotheca Seraphico-capuccina) 51 [Rome: 1996], 146, n. 19). F. Chavero Blanco, on the contrary, thinks that this edition is useful to resolve the issue which was raised by Ratzinger about the Joachimite involutions attested by various texts present in the edition of Quaracchi, which are instead absent in Delorme's edition (Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 61–63). I do not think that the anti-intellectual and Joachimite images pointed out by Ratzinger in the edition of Quaracchi are absent in the manuscript discovered in Leningrad, but in any case, one can find the solution in the rereading of the interpretations in spiritual directions and anti-intellectual tendencies attributed to these texts by the German scholar, whose correctness I doubt: see P. Maranesi, "Per un contributo alla questione bonaventuriana" in *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 58 (1995), esp. 290–298.

[53] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, pp. 152–8, Brady lists two new manuscripts, which could call for a new edition ("The *opera*," 137–8).

[54] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 134–155. Cf. Bougerol, "De la 'Reportatio' à la 'redactio'," in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales* (Louvain-la-Neuve: 1982), 51–65. This work would have been made necessary by the "Quaestio reportata de mendicitate cum annotationibus Guilelmi de S. Amore" published by F. Delorme and attributed by him "a quodam clerico" (S. Bonaventurae, *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, xxiv; edition of the text, 328–356).

[55] Ed. Quaracchi, 9, 8–21; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 95.

[56] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 553–566; the authenticity confirmed by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 81–82, has been contested by J.G. Bougerol, "Le manuscrit Paris Mazarine 987 et le Sermon 'Confiteantur' faussement attribué à saint Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 86 (1993): 3–4.

[57] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 23–25; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 124.

[58] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 674–6; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 125.

[59] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 151 (Additamentum); considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 126.

[60] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 131–151; The text is considered authentic by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 22. It is decidedly rejected by Brady, "The writings," 195–196, and by Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 74–76.

De speculatione Dei per vestigia eius in universo[61]
De triplici via. Prologus[62]
De viti mystica (forma longior)[63]
Determinationes Quaestionum circa Regula FF. Minorum[64]
Epistola ad quendam novitium insolentem et instabilem[65]
Epistola continens XXV memorialia[66]
Epistola de imitatione Christi[67]
Epistola de sandaliis Apostolorum[68]
Expositio super Regulam[69]
Lignum vitae (Haec est)[70]
Meditatio de passione Iesu Christi[71]
Philomena[72]
Postille super librum sapientiae[73]

---

[61] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 19–27 (Additamentum III); considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 127.

[62] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 18 (Additamentum I); considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 128–129.

[63] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 189–229; text rejected by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 212–213; for Brady, both this form and the short one (Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 159–189) are to be considered spurious (see "The edition," 138, and "The *opera*," 138).

[64] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 337–374; The text is made up of two parts: 337–356 and 356–374. All reject the Bonaventurian authorship of the second part. There is no agreement on the first part. Distelbrink is in favour, but all the others against: Brady, "The writings," 107–108, Bougerol, *Introduzione*, 255, Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 86–88.

[65] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 663–666; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 135.

[66] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 491–8; authentic for Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 43, but spurious for Brady, "The Edition," 372–376, and "The *opera*," 138–140.

[67] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 499–503; Distelbrink includes it among the writings, although he thinks that a later author gave the current form to the text, transforming Bonaventure's sermon (*Bonaventurae*, 44); the other scholars reject the authenticity (Brady, "The writings," 111, and Bougerol, *Introduzione*, 256).

[68] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 386–390; it is authentic for Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 45, but it is to be considered spurious for Brady, "The Edition," 372–376, and "The *opera*," 138; Bougerol attributes it to John Pechkam (*Introduzione*, 255), as does Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 88.

[69] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 391–437; its authenticity has been long discussed: Delorme, P.C. Harkins, and Brady attribute it to John Peckham, while S. Clasen and Distelbrink attribute it to Bonaventura (see Bougerol, *Introduzione*, 255–256, and Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 88–90).

[70] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 86–87 (Additamentum); considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 152.

[71] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 676–677; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 154.

[72] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 669–674; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 168.

[73] Ed. Quaracchi, 6, 108–235; Distelbrink considers them authentic (*Bonaventurae*, 18–19); J.G. Bougerol ("Pecia et critique d'authenticité. Le problème du 'super sapientiam' attribué à Bonaventure," in *La production du libre universitaire au Moyen Age. Exemplar et pecia* [Paris: 1988], 121–135, taking a position that denies what he affirmed in his *Introduction*, 185–6) and D.M. Monti ("A reconsideration of the Authorship of the Commentary of

Prothemata[74]
Quare fratres praedicent et confessiones audiant[75]
Sermo super Regulam[76]
Speculum disciplinae ad novitios[77]
Summa de gradibus virtutum[78]
Tractatus de plantatione paradisi[79]
Tractatus de praeparatione ad Missam[80]

Concluding Considerations

In spite of the comments I have made up to this point about the innovations of the Complete works, I think that the volumes produced by the Quaracchi do not need a substantial review. I believe that the essential base of that critical proposal maintains its value for a real acquaintance with Bonaventure's writings. Although there are new publications of texts, I do not believe these justify a new critical edition of the entire *Omnia Opera*. However, one must recognize that there are publications of new editions, and other publications reissued with a more careful critical review of the texts. Perhaps there could be an edition of a new volume, as a supplement, in which to re-unite all these innovations and to add this to the remaining nine volumes of the edition of Quaracchi.

---

the Book of Wisdom attributed to St. Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 79 (1986): 359–391, attribute the work to the Dominican friar Giovanni di Verdy.

[74] Ed. Quaracchi, 9; in favour of authenticity, Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 59–60; J. Bataillon has reservations about the second part of the text.

[75] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 375–381, for Distelbrink, the text is Bonaventurian (*Bonaventurae*, 51–52); this view is rejected by Brady, "Writings," 107–108, and by Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 89–90.

[76] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 438–448; only Distelbrink accepts its authenticity (*Bonaventurae*, 86–87), even although he refers to the contrary opinion of Clasen and Brady, "The writings," 111. Bougerol denies the authenticity (*Introduzione*, 256, see also Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 90–91).

[77] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 583–622; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 193.

[78] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 647–654; considered spurious also by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 198.

[79] Ed. Quaracchi, 5, 574–579; the same authors were uncertain about its attribution. It was confirmed by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 87. Bougerol doubted it: *Introduzione*, 224.

[80] Ed. Quaracchi, 8, 99–105; Brady doubts its authenticity ("The *Opera*," 136–137, see also Blanco, *El Cátalogo*, 74); but this is regarded as certain by Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae*, 29–30.

BONAVENTURE'S THEOLOGICAL METHOD

Gregory LaNave

Ever since the publication of the Quaracchi edition, Bonaventure's theological methodology has been a source of interest to scholars. The interest is justified by his *corpus* itself. Some of his most famous writings are methodological reflections on the way that one comes to understand revelation, and creation in relation to revelation (e.g., *De reductione artium ad theologiam; Christus unus omnium magister*). In addition, he pursues the common thirteenth-century task of presenting theology as a systematic whole (e.g., *Commentaria in libris Sententiarum; Breviloquium; Collationes in Hexaëmeron; Itinerarium mentis in Deum*). At the same time, these *compendia* display obviously distinctive elements of Bonaventure's approach. Thus, for example, the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* weave together philosophical, theological, spiritual, historical, and ecclesiological considerations; the *Itinerarium* is a spiritual *tour de force* that runs from the basic elements of creation to the union of God; and the *Breviloquium* Bonaventure describes as a kind of *summa*, even though it abandons the customary *quaestio* format of the genre.

For much of the twentieth century, Bonaventure was read in comparison with neo-Thomist Scholasticism. As the overriding concern of neo-Thomism was philosophical, much attention was paid to the relationship of faith and reason in Bonaventure's works. The common question was whether he really presents a philosophy that is distinct from his theology. The general expansion of medieval studies in the mid-twentieth century, and the waning of the neo-Thomistic hegemony in Catholic theology following the Second Vatican Council, opened up different perspectives on Bonaventure's works. The strictly philosophical questions ceased to predominate. Recent studies have tried therefore to refine the understanding of his theological methodology, as well as offer new architectonic views—for example, to describe Bonaventure's theology as distinctively influenced by St Francis, or as a synthesis of symbolic and scientific speculation, or in light of contemporary movements in theology.

The result is that today there is not one view of Bonaventure's theological methodology. This essay will offer a reading of his key texts on the subject—largely, but not exclusively, those mentioned above. The perspective might be described as that of Bonaventure the scholastic *magister*.

Some of the texts in question date from his days at the University of Paris (especially the *Sentences* commentary, the *Breviloquium*, and *De reductione*); others were written later, even much later, and do not display the same kind of dependence on the theology of the schools. Yet throughout this *corpus* one can see the Seraphic Doctor as cognizant of the fundamental issues that drove school theology. His modes of expression come to differ substantially from those of Aquinas, not to mention Albert and Scotus. But when he speaks of key issues such as the knowability of God, the relationship between God and creation, human epistemology, and the influence of grace, he is always concerned with the realities at stake, as were the *magistri*. As recent years have seen a *ressourcement* in studies of Aquinas, expanding greatly the view of his theological method, so it seems profitable to regard Bonaventure in that perspective. Such is the spirit that animates this essay.

What Is Theology?

The Meaning of "Theologia"

Bonaventure does not offer a clear and distinct definition of "theology." This is not surprising. The term *theologia* is only one of several expressions commonly used in the thirteenth century to describe the activity of those whom we would recognize as theologians. Those works where one might most naturally expect Bonaventure to give a precise definition—the university works such as the commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard and the *Breviloquium*—reflect this ambiguity. In the prologue to bk. 1 of the *Sentences* commentary, Bonaventure speaks not of *theologia* but of *iste liber*—that is, Lombard's text. In the prologue and beginning of chapter one of the *Breviloquium*, on the other hand, he speaks of *sacra Scriptura sive theologia*, suggesting some kind of formal identity between them.

To introduce the subject of Bonaventure's theological method, it is worthwhile to look specifically at different settings in which he uses the word *theologia*, and to see how the range of its meaning varies with the different purposes it is used to satisfy.

Theologia is occasionally used to denote a certain field of knowledge in its distinction from all other fields. Such is the case most notably in *De reductione artium ad theologiam* and *Hexaëmeron* 1. In *De reductione*, theology is the knowledge proper to the light of sacred scripture, and is specifically distinct from the knowledge pertaining to the mechanical arts, the senses, and various forms of philosophy. In *Hexaëmeron* 1,

Bonaventure presents a series of sciences of which Christ is the center; the name *theologia* is reserved for the last, that science that deals with the state of man in glory. Theology is thus distinguished from metaphysics, logic, ethics, etc.

Common to both these texts is an expansion and contraction of the meaning of theology. On the one hand, there is an expansion, for the other sciences are not presented as simply distinct from theology; rather, it is only insofar as one is attentive to the realities revealed by God that the sciences can come to their full fruition.[1] On the other hand, theology, properly speaking, denotes that field of knowledge that is distinct from the apprehension of revealed realities that is possible in the other sciences. Therefore, theology deals not with the full range of intelligibility of revealed realities, but only with that which can be known of them precisely as revealed.

Bonaventure also identifies three kinds of theology: symbolic, mystical, and proper (*proprie*).[2] The distinction is based on several convictions. One is that revelation is not exclusively the communication of truths that can be known clearly, if only by faith, in propositional form. Rather, God reveals his truth in symbols and figures, some of which have a multiplicity of meanings. When theology considers the sensible realities of the world, it does not consider them as simple *res*, but as *signa.* The theology that considers these realities is "symbolic theology."[3] Another conviction is that God's revelation has an unfathomable depth of meaning, which requires of the theologian a form of life that attunes him to this depth. Corresponding to this conviction is another, that some of the realities one considers in theology are so disproportionate to the powers of the soul that one cannot grasp them without entering into them. This is the realm of "mystical theology"; it is restricted to those who are specially suited to engage in it.[4]

In addition to symbolic and mystical theology, there is theology "properly speaking" (*proprie*). This is the level of theological knowledge best

---

[1] Much has been written about Christ as the center of metaphysics. Less has been said about the other sciences.

[2] See esp. *Hex.* 20.21 (5, 429) and *Itin.* 1.7 (5, 297–298).

[3] See Leonard J. Bowman, "A View of St. Bonaventure's Symbolic Theology," in *Thomas and Bonaventure*, ed. G. McLean, *American Catholic Philosophical Association* 4 (1974): 25–32.

[4] Though these words are not used in *De don. Spir.* 4 (5, 473–479), the convictions that animate them are certainly present there. There are hints of the distinction as well in the second and fourth days of creation, considered in the *Hexaëmeron.*

suited to the nature of the human mind.[5] Man can consider the sensible symbols of revelation or the mysteries that of their nature far exceed him, but he is best suited to consider realities that are of their nature intellectual and proportionate to the powers of the soul. This level of theology serves a critical purpose for the Church as well; it considers those truths revealed by God and dogmatically recognized by the church which are the foundations of the church. Without such knowledge it is impossible to be firm in the faith. "Every pontiff ought to know this science,"[6] for the intelligible order of the church depends on it.[7]

In sum, while Bonaventure recognizes a proper plurality in types of theology, he has in mind one kind that is best suited to intellectual inquiry, which is of particular ecclesial significance.

More difficult to define, and requiring more careful distinction, is the similarity and difference between theology and scripture, especially as presented in the *Breviloquium.* Bonaventure uses expressions that indicate some kind of equivalence between theology and scripture (e.g., "sacra Scriptura *sive* theologia"). He also identifies two different modes of discourse, one used by scripture as proper to it, the other to be used in the exposition of scripture. Corresponding to the latter is a distinction in subject between scripture (viz., "*credibile ut credibile*") and the books of the fathers and doctors that seek to understand scripture (viz., "*credibile ut intelligibile*").[8] It is certain, of course, that Bonaventure would not claim the status for his own work, as theologian, that he accords to scripture. What, then, could the meaning of his "identification" of scripture and theology be?[9] Henry Donneaud[10] has suggested that *theologia* in the *Breviloquium* should not be understood as the intellectual activity of the human author attempting to understand revelation, but rather as the knowledge of God communicated in revelation for the sake of human salvation. Bonaventure does recognize an intellectual activity that we would call

---

[5] The triple modes of theology—*symbolica, proprie, et mystica*—parallel the division of the reality engaged by man into things below the soul, the soul, and things above the soul; see *Itin.* 1.7 (5, 297–298).

[6] *De don. Spir.* 4.17 (5, 477).

[7] *Hex.* 20.21 (5, 429).

[8] *Brev.* 1.1 (5, 210).

[9] See, e.g., George H. Tavard, "La théologie d'apres le Bréviloque de Saint Bonaventure," *Année théologique* 10 (1949): 201-14; Bougerol, *Introduction*, 199–201; Bérubé, *De la philosophie à la sagesse*, 117–30.

[10] Henry Donneaud, "Le sens du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure: Étude critique à propos d'un ouvrage récent," *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 271–95; "Sens et contresens herméneutique du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure," *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 625–50.

theology, but this is not what he means by *theologia* when he identifies this with scripture. The work of the *Breviloquium* may therefore rightly be called "theology" in two distinct senses. As theology that is equivalent to the divine science, or *sacra doctrina*,[11] the *Breviloquium* simply sets out the truths revealed in scripture according to their proper order; it is thus much like a catechetical *compendium theologiae.* As the human discursive activity called "theology," the *Breviloquium* applies the standards of human rationality to the revealed given, producing copious arguments to show the necessity or fittingness of the revealed given.

Emmanuel Falque has offered a much different interpretation. In his view,[12] Bonaventure does not in the *Breviloquium* intend to equate theology and scripture, formulas aside. Falque suggests that the *Breviloquium* marks a sharp departure from the theological method of the *Sentences* commentary, with its scholastic *quaestio* format. Composed several years after the *Sentences* commentary, the *Breviloquium* presents a theology that operates in the interior of revelation, in the sense that it does not engage in disputes regarding the revealed given according to human rationality, but rather unfolds the revealed given for the sole purpose of making its truth manifest. The mode of proceeding in the *Breviloquium* is, according to Falque, one of manifestation rather than demonstration.[13]

At stake in the disputes is the proper mode of proceeding in theology and its object.[14] Also at stake is whether Bonaventure has a consistent view of theological method from the *Sentences* commentary to the *Breviloquium* and—by implication and *a fortiori*—to later works as well.

The Formal Distinction of Theology

Characteristic of the High Scholastics was their location of their definitions of theology. Methodologically, one would expect the nature of a discipline

---

[11] Cf. Chenu, *La théologie comme science*, 3–57, 78–79.

[12] Emmanuel Falque, "Le contresens du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure: Réponse au frère Henry Donneaud," *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 615–24, esp. 617.

[13] Dominic Monti, by contrast, associates the technique of demonstration more closely with the *Breviloquium* than with the *Sentences* commentary. See Monti, "Introduction," in Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, trans. Dominic V. Monti, O.F.M. (Works of St Bonaventure) 9 (Saint Bonaventure, N.Y.: 2005), xxii–xxxviii. On demonstration in the *Sentences* commentary, see Marco Arosio, " 'Credibile ut intelligibile': Sapienza e ruolo del 'Modus ratiocinativus sive inquisitivus' nell'epistemologia teologica del *Commento alle Sentenze* di Bonaventura da Bagnoregio," *Doctor seraphicus* 40–41 (1993–94): 175–236.

[14] See sections of this essay below.

to be delineated, if anywhere, at the outset of any comprehensive work of that discipline. For the theologians of the mid-thirteenth century, the typical works of this nature were their commentaries on Lombard's *Sentences* and their *Summae.*[15] So it is with Bonaventure: his clearest delineation of theology as an academic discipline that seeks the intellection of faith[16] lies in the four questions of the prologue to bk. 1 of his commentary on the *Sentences*, which cover the four causes of *iste liber.* The same subject is treated in a somewhat different way in the prologue and beginning of bk. 1 of the *Breviloquium.*

Qu. 1 of the *Sentences* prologue concerns the material cause, or object, of theology. Bonaventure distinguishes three aspects of the object: *principium radicale, totum integrale*, and *totum universale.* It is the third that gives the most formal definition of theology—what in later scholastic theology was called the formal *quo* object of theology.[17] Bonaventure's term for this is *totum universale*, the "universal whole"—that which is predicated of every part of the discipline, or that quality that causes something to fall under a given discipline.[18] The *totum universale* of theology is "the things of faith, insofar as they pass over into the understanding, by the addition of reason" (*credibile, prout tamen credibile transit in rationem intelligibilis, et hoc per additionem rationis*).[19] The *Breviloquium* offers a more compact definition: theology concerns "the things of faith as intelligible" (*credibile ut intelligibile*).[20]

Common to both definitions is the distinction made between theology and any other discipline or kind of knowing. Theology is distinguished from those disciplines that deal with what is known solely by the natural light of reason. Its object is the *credibile.* This does not necessarily mean that theology concerns only that which is revealed, for nothing so far prevents some things from being known both by reason and by faith (e.g., the existence of God). Furthermore, theology occupies a place

---

[15] Occasionally, as with Odo Rigaud, we find a *quaestio disputata* on the nature of theology.

[16] Cf. Donneaud's distinction between Theology (= *sacra doctrina* = *sacra Scriptura*) and theology (i.e., the theology of the theologians): Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence de la foi*, 438–47.

[17] Note that the formal *quo* object is different from the formal cause. The former concerns the specific difference of a discipline: that is, what it considers, and under what formality. The latter concerns the "mode of proceeding": that is, the way that one goes about the exercise of the discipline.

[18] See the *scholion* to this question in the Quaracchi edition, esp. part 5 (1, 9).

[19] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 1 (1, 6–8).

[20] *Brev.* 1.1 (5, 210).

in the apprehension of the revealed that is distinct from other forms of apprehension—namely, faith and the intellection possible to the "pure of heart" who "see God." Theology differs from faith, for it concerns the move from faith to understanding. Moreover, it differs from the intellection of the blessed, insofar as that intellection has lost its transitory character. This is a point better emphasized in the lengthier definition of the *Sentences* commentary than in the formula of the *Breviloquium.* Theology concerns not what is seen, but what is believed (*credibile*), and is characterized more by reaching toward understanding than by the full possession thereof (*transit in rationem intelligibilis*).

The precise scope of theology, within this range of the knowledge of the things of faith, is a little ambiguous. In the later collations on the gifts of the Holy Spirit, Bonaventure distinguishes four kinds of *scientia*: philosophical science, which is the certain knowledge of truth as it can be investigated; theological science, which is the pious knowledge of truth as believed; graced science, which is the holy knowledge of truth as believed and loved; and glorious science, which is the sempiternal knowledge of truth as desirable.[21] The philosophical sciences are clearly demarcated, but the intellection that follows on faith for those who are *in via* has three forms: theological, graced, and glorious.[22] In this schema, what distinguishes theological science from graced science is twofold. First, the former is more obviously presented as an intellectual activity than the latter.[23] Second, theological science, whatever the conditions necessary for its exercise, is a cognition that comes through an intellectual activity undertaken by a human subject; graced science, on the other hand, is the gift of the Holy Spirit. Though the latter certainly issues in cognition, its agent is the Holy Spirit.

To sum up: theology considers the things of faith as they come to be understood by the addition of reason. It is thus distinct from philosophy, faith, the Holy Spirit's gift of knowledge, and the knowledge of the blessed. It is based in revelation; it is not the simple acceptance of revelation, but an activity that follows upon that reception.[24]

---

[21] *De don. Spir.* 4.5 (5, 474).

[22] "Glorious science" refers most properly to the knowledge possessed by the blessed, but it "begins in contemplatives" (*De don. Spir.* 4.25) (5, 479).

[23] The significance of "pious knowledge," and its properly intellectual character, will be dealt with below. It should be said that the blending of the intellectual and the affective here, though present in different ways in these two sciences, is typical of Bonaventure's whole understanding of theology.

[24] See John F. Quinn, "The Rôle of the Holy Spirit in St. Bonaventure's Theology," *Franciscan Studies* 33 (1973): 275f. Quinn distinguishes in Bonaventure's sense of theology

The Subject of Theology

By the time Bonaventure began his studies in theology in Paris, Aristotle's influence on articulations of theological methodology was well marked. What came to be regarded as the classic question—whether theology is a science—was sometimes posed, and sometimes not. But even when it was not, the questions that were posed show the mark of a consideration of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*.[25] Thus, after defining how theology is distinct from other sciences, one asks what theology is about: what is the subject of theology?

In an Aristotelian science, the subject in the strictest sense is that which is properly known in the science. One can describe this as that whose parts, passions, and properties are treated in the science, or that which is principally intended. It is the extramental reality that is the terminus of the act of knowing in the science.[26] Indirectly, the subject provides unity to the science, for, however many things are considered, they are considered precisely as they are related to the principally intended subject.

Defining a science by its subject has a special significance in the case of theology (or any other science that deals with something the actual existence of which is not a matter of indifference to the knower). The subject is, properly speaking, an extramental reality; the object, by contrast, is the purely logical terminus of the act of knowing. A science defined by its object is concerned only that what it knows properly belongs to the science; it seeks to know as many such things as possible. A science defined by its subject, on the other hand, is concerned with its subject, and seeks only to know what will help it understand its subject better; it is guided by its sense for that subject.[27]

"three individual forms of knowledge having an essential and common ground in the one divine revelation": the science of scripture, the science of faith generated from scripture according to discursive reasoning (theology properly speaking), and the wisdom of faith.

[25] See, e.g., the *Summa halensis* (or *Summa fratris Alexandri*), which denies that theology is a science, and yet goes on to distinguish it from other sciences and then delineate its matter and mode (thus following the order of Aristotelian questions: *utrum sit, quoddammodo est*, and *quid est*).

[26] See William Wallace, *The Role of Demonstration in Moral Theology* (Washington, D.C.: 1962), 23–27.

[27] As Jean-Pierre Torrell has commented, "Theology experienced a dramatic turn the day when, deceived by the definition of a science as a 'habit of conclusions' and forgetful of the distinction between the subject and the object and its real import, theologians, beginning in the 14th century, came to regard the end of their science no longer as the knowledge of its subject, but that of its object, 'to deduce the most possible conclusions

Bonaventure clearly has the Aristotelian criteria in mind as he formulates his theological methodology in the *Sentences* commentary and the *Breviloquium*. The style of his writing changes over time: the *quaestio* format of the earlier works gives way to a progress of ascent in the *Itinerarium* and a strongly symbolic structure in the *Hexaëmeron.* While the later texts display Bonaventure's reliance on Aristotle in a number of ways, the strictly formal structure of an Aristotelian science is not in view, despite the comprehensive scope of these works. Nevertheless, what we find in the earlier works provides a good guide to Bonaventure's thought regarding the subject of theology in his later works as well.

As noted above, qu. 1 of the *Sentences* prologue concerns in part the formal distinction of *iste liber* from any other *scientia*—Bonaventure calls this the *totum universale* of theology. The same question, which is on the "material cause or subject" of theology, presents two other ways of identifying what theology is about. Bonaventure says that, in any science, the subject may be thought of not only as the *totum universale*, but also as the *totum integrale* and the *principium radicale.* The *totum integrale* encompasses everything that is treated in the science, setting them in order to one another. It is predicated of the subject as a whole, and not of any one part in isolation (unlike the *totum universale*). The *principium radicale* is the irreducible point of reduction in the science, the ultimate source of the whole. Together, the *totum integrale* and the *principium radicale* exhibit the characteristics that must mark the subject. Every science must have a single subject, but in Bonaventure's view this unity pertains both to the ordering of all the parts and to their reduction to a single source. In theology, the subject as the *principium radicale* is God; as the *totum integrale*, it is the whole Christ, God and man, head and members.

In the background of this distinction may lurk the doctrine of Bonaventure's teacher Alexander of Hales, as expressed in the *Summa halensis*.[28] When Alexander asks what the subject of theology is, he responds by appealing to a distinction made by Pseudo-Dionysius, according to which divine realities comprise substance, power, and operation. The substance is the bed-rock reality, which because of its substantiality has a power, which acts in proper operations. Or, conversely, the first thing one encounters is the operation, which must come from a power, which

from the truths contained in the deposit of revelation' ": Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., "Le savoir théologique chez saint Thomas," *Revue thomiste* 96 (1996): 382.

[28] *Summa halensis*, lib. 1, tract. intro., q. 1, c. 3.

reveals its source. In theology, according to Alexander, the substance is God, the power is Christ, and the operations are the works of restoration. There is here no formal object *quo* as we find in Bonaventure's *totum universale*; rather, there is a series of related material objects, or a complex formal object *quod*: God made known through the works of redemption, worked by Christ.[29]

Bonaventure does not advert explicitly to the Dionysian distinction, but his *principium radicale/totum integrale* distinction repeats the same structure. The *totum integrale* is not a mere assemblage of material objects, but an ordered whole;[30] moreover, its order comes from the fact that one can be led back by reduction from it to its *principium radicale.* An even clearer correspondence is visible in the *Breviloquium*, with the distinction of the subject *a quo* (God), *per quod* (Christ), and *ad quod* (the works of redemption).[31] Bonaventure, like his teachers, conceives of the subject of theology—the formal object *quod*—not only as integrative, but as expressive of that which ultimately lies behind it.

It is this interplay of *principium radicale* and *totum integrale*—the relationship between them—that is the distinctive mark of Bonaventure's theology. To say that "God" is the subject of theology—as one might do simply on nominative grounds—is not enough. Thomas Aquinas, when he addresses this point,[32] specifies that it is God in his divinity that is the subject of theology; it is thus distinct from metaphysics, which considers God as the cause of its proper subject (i.e., being). By adding that theology considers "all things as they are related to God," Aquinas indicates that theology should always be seen as a working-out of the relationship of creatures to God: their origin from and return to him. Bonaventure, while he would agree with Aquinas on these two points, yet chooses to emphasize something else.

---

[29] Odo Rigaud, though he makes more distinctions in this regard than does the *Summa halensis*, in one perspective (i.e., that of the division of the subject "de quo" and "circa quod") repeats precisely the same doctrine: Odo Rigaud, *Quaestio de scientia theologiae*, pars 1, q. 3. See Leonardo Sileo, *Teoria della scienza teologica: Quaestio de scientia theologiae di Odo Rigaldi e altri testi inediti (1230–1250)* (Rome: 1984), paragraphs 78–83.

[30] The *totum integrale* "encompasses many things not only through composition, but through union and order" (I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2) (1, 9–11).

[31] Bonaventure speaks also in the *Breviloquium* of the subject *circa quod,* which is "the one bond of love joining heaven and earth" and two subjects *de quo:* that with which the canonical books are concerned, and that with which the books of the commentators are concerned (5, 210). His contemporaries generally speak of the subject *circa quod* as a set of material objects, unmarked by formal unity; Bonaventure gives a twist to the meaning of "circa," focusing on the sense of that around which the material of theology is ordered.

[32] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 1, a. 7; cf. I *Sent.*, prooem., q. un., a. 4 (1, 8).

To say that God is the subject "from whom all things come" could suggest ambivalence with respect to a specifically philosophical metaphysics, for the metaphysician knows by his consideration of creatures that they do not explain themselves and that they therefore must come from God. But what the philosophical metaphysician knows, the theological metaphysician knows more fully. According to Bonaventure's "theological metaphysics,"[33] one sees that the cause that explains creaturely being is not only the God who stands outside of creation as its efficient cause, but the God who is in himself a mystery of self-diffusive goodness, and who as such is the exemplary principle of his creation. Because of his knowledge of the Trinity, the theologian has a certain conception of the God "from whom all things come."

It would be an exaggeration to say that when Bonaventure speaks of God, therefore, he is always speaking of the Trinity as such. It has often been noted that Bonaventure never composed a treatise *de Deo uno*.[34] Most strikingly, the first part of his personal *summa*, the *Breviloquium*, speaks of God in himself only in terms of the Trinity. Yet one does not find, in the general argumentation of the same work, which explains each doctrine of faith by reference to the "First Principle," a constant invocation of the Trinity.[35] Indeed, when Bonaventure offers arguments in this work based on qualities of the First Principle, it is rare that he mentions the Trinitarian nature of that principle. It is better to say that the *Breviloquium* displays the same sense of God that one finds in the disputed questions *De mysterio Trinitatis*: the same God may be considered under the aspect of the unity of his being or under the aspect of the Trinity of Persons.[36] To know God according to the former is to know him with certitude, and it is a way of knowing that is in principle open to the philosopher, though it is best known by the theologian; to know God according to the latter

[33] The phrase comes from the seminal article by Zachary Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure," *The Journal of Religion* 58 supplement (1978): 82–96.

[34] On this topic, see Gregory F. LaNave, "Bonaventure's Arguments for the Existence of God and an 'Independent' *De Deo Uno*," *The Thomist* 74 (2010): 77–84.

[35] Dominic Monti ("Introduction," xiii–l) shows that the overall structure of the *Breviloquium* displays this Trinitarian sense, but this is not to say that each theological argument offered along the way does the same.

[36] *De myst. Trin.* comprises eight questions. The first seven are divided into two articles in each. In each case, the first article deals with the divine being, while the second deals with the Trinity of persons. The same parallel is found in chs. 5 ("On the speculation of the divine unity through its primary name, which is Being") and 6 ("On the speculation of the most blessed Trinity in its name, which is Good") of the *Itinerarium.* See Hammond, "Order in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*."

aspect is likewise to know him with certitude, but a certitude that is intelligible only in light of faith. In short, Bonaventure's identification of God as the subject of theology *a quo*, or as the *principium radicale*, allows him to unite in theology those things that are known properly by faith and those that can be known even without faith, though the latter are better and more securely known by those who have faith. The architectonic principle of Bonaventure's theology is faith's insight into the self-diffusive goodness of the Trinitarian God; specific theological arguments are less ineluctably Trinitarian.

The other distinctive aspect of Bonaventure's identification of the subject of theology is his invocation of Christ. This is a constant in Bonaventure's works, though he adverts to Christ in different ways. In the *Sentences* commentary, it is the incarnate Christ who integrates all the material aspects of theology (God and man, head and members). In the *Breviloquium*, Christ is presented as both the one "through whom" (*per quod*) all things are (i.e., the uncreated Word) and the first principle of redemption (viz., the incarnate Word).[37] Later works (e.g., *Itinerarium, Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti, Hexaëmeron*) refer to the "uncreated, incarnate, and inspired Word," and even to the "crucified Word."[38] And in *Hexaëmeron* 1, Christ is called the center of all knowledge.[39] A summary of Bonaventure's doctrine on this point might be as follows. As the one through whom all things were made, the eternal Word is the exemplary cause of creation. To know any created thing most properly is to know it in the Word. Moreover, the Word holds this position because it is, within the Trinity, the expressive likeness of the Father. The self-expression that is the inner logic of the Trinity becomes the locus for the intelligibility of creation. Therefore, it is not God simply who is the subject of theology, but precisely God as self-expressive in the eternal, uncreated Word, which becomes the principle of other manifestations of the Word, namely, as inspired, incarnate, and crucified. Every

---

[37] *Brev.* (5, 210); references to the incarnate Word as the first principle of redemption run throughout the text, especially in the explanations given with respect to the incarnation, grace, and the sacraments (e.g., "The explanation of this is as follows: The incarnate Word, who is the principle of our reparation (. . .)": 5, 266–267).

[38] *Itin.* 4.3 (5, 306); *De don. Spir.* 1.5 (5, 458); *Hex.* 3.2 (5, 343). See Sebastian Schmidt, "Christus als 'scala nostra': Christozentrische Aspekte im 'Itinerarium mentis in Deum' des heiligen Bonaventura," *Franziskanische Studien* 75 (1993): 243–338; Pietro Maranesi, *Verbum Inspiratum: Chiave ermeneutica dell'Hexaemeron di San Bonaventura* (Rome: 1996); Alexander Gerken, *Theologie des Wortes: Das Verhältnis von Schöpfung und Inkarnation bei Bonaventura* (Düsseldorf: 1962). Hans Urs von Balthasar speaks of this as "the total form of revelation that is the threefold Logos": "Bonaventure," in Idem, *The Glory of the Lord*, vol. 2, trans. Andrew Louth, Francis McDonagh, and Brian McNeil (San Francisco: 1984), 325.

[39] *Hex.* 1.11ff (5, 331ff.).

part of theology displays a consideration of God through the medium of Christ. Created realities established by God with salvific purposes, such as the church or the sacraments, are especially considered with respect to the incarnate Word; the revelation of God in scripture and in history occurs through the inspired Word; and the consideration of God in himself occurs through both the uncreated and the crucified Word. In sum, in many different ways, Bonaventure's conception of theology requires one to be attentive to the expression of God in Christ.[40]

The Science of Theology

In the *Sentences* commentary, the question of the subject of theology is followed by the question of the "mode of proceeding"—the formal cause of theology.[41] Theology has been distinguished from other kinds of knowledge, and its unique subject identified; the next question to be raised is how theology goes about its business. It is here that Bonaventure explicitly invokes the apparatus of an Aristotelian science, although, as mentioned above, he never asks the question whether theology is a science. The topic may be divided into two significant parts: the mode of proceeding on particular theological points, and the mode of proceeding in a theological treatise as a whole. "Science" as applied to theology usually brings to mind the structure of a theological argument: that it reasons from principles to conclusions. The same structure is evident in theology as a whole. The truths of the faith form a hierarchy, with subordinate truths no less true than primary ones, but nevertheless dependent on them. Theological reason uncovers the logic of this hierarchy.

The Structure of Theological Reasoning

The early Franciscan school took from William of Auxerre the comparison of the articles of faith to the first principles of a science.[42] That theology should proceed in a scientific fashion, deducing conclusions in strictly logical fashion from revealed givens, was accepted by them without much

---

[40] See Andrea Di Maio,"La divisione bonaventuriana delle scienze: Un' applicazione della lessicografia all'ermeneutica testuale (I)," *Gregorianum* 81 (2000): 101–36, esp. 124.

[41] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2 (1, 10–11).

[42] See Chenu, *La théologie comme science*, 34–37; Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence*, 19–48. For William, see *Magistri Guillelmi Altissiodorensis Summa Aurea*, ed. J. Ribaillier, vol. 1 (Spicilegium bonaventurianum) 16 (Paris and Grottaferrata: 1980).

comment.[43] Where they disagreed was on the question of whether this was sufficient for theology to be named a science. Odo and the authors of the *Summa halensis* refuse to call theology a science.[44] Bonaventure takes a different tack.

For Bonaventure, the motive behind the inquiry into the things of faith is important: mere curiosity leads to no good, but a studious application is legitimate.[45] Such a virtue makes one's approach to the subject matter appropriate. This sets the stage for the crucial distinction regarding the mode of proceeding in theology, namely, that it be judged in light of the mode of proceeding in scripture.[46] Like Alexander before him, Bonaventure notes that scripture does not proceed by way of division and distinction, but by narrative, parable, exhortation, etc.—in a word, a "*modus authenticus*."[47] Theology has a different mode of proceeding because theology is not scripture, though it is based in scripture.

To explain this relationship, Bonaventure has recourse to the Aristotelian doctrine of subalternation.[48] The doctrine is laid out by Aristotle in book one, chapter thirteen of the *Posterior Analytics*. There he explains the difference between knowing a fact and knowing the "reasoned fact"—that something is versus why it is. This difference is first of all visible within one and the same science: for example, the astronomer knows the *fact* that the planets are near from the fact that they do not twinkle, but he knows the *reasoned fact* that they do not twinkle *because* they are near. Aristotle goes on to say that the same difference can be found between two sciences: thus, for example, optics knows the facts of the properties of visual lines, but geometry knows the reasoned fact (i.e., the reason why lines have these properties). The higher, mathematical science pertains to

---

[43] See Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence*, 463.

[44] Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologiae* (*Summa halensis*), tract. intro., q. 1, c. 1 (Quaracchi: 1924–48); Odo Rigaud, *Quaestio*, pars 1, q. 1 (ed. Sileo, para. 20).

[45] This is a point on which there is a clear deepening of his thought over time. In the *Sentences* commentary and the *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus ad magistrum innominatum*, it is the virtue of *studiositas* that is a counterpoint to the vice of *curiositas*. In the *Legenda maior*, in a strikingly similar passage (quoting Prov. 25:27), the key virtue appears to be Francis' *conformitas*. Kevin Hughes has argued that such conformity permeates the very form of the *Hexaëmeron*: "St. Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*: Fractured Sermons and Protreptic Discourse," *Franciscan Studies* 63 (2005): 107–29.

[46] See *Brev.* prol. 5–6 (5, 206–207); I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 1, ad 5–6 (1, 8); prooem., q. 2, ad 4 (1, 11).

[47] *Brev.* prol. 5 (5, 206–207) (in the *Sent.*, this is "*modus typicus*").

[48] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2 (1, 9–11). It is generally acknowledged (see Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence*, 470 n. 79) that Bonaventure is the first to make this appeal.

the demonstration of the causes, while the lower, physical sciences pertain to particular instances of the fact.[49]

Some scholastics argued that the knowledge of the articles in faith and the knowledge of them in theology differ according to the relationship of subalternation, for theology takes the articles as given and draws conclusions from them. However, as Donneaud points out,[50] this presents a conundrum. Theology is devoted to unfolding the rationality of the things of faith, and to that extent appears to deal with the "reasoned fact." Yet it would follow that theology is a higher science than faith, not a lower—a conclusion that would appeal to none but the most diehard rationalists.

Bonaventure does not concern himself with the qualities of fact and reasoned fact, but only with the relationship of principles. Theology (in the *Sent.*, "iste liber") is said to be subalternated to scripture[51] because it shares the same object of scripture, but considered in light of two sets of principles. No one would say that the knowledge of the Gospel of John is formally different from (and therefore a different science from) the knowledge of scripture as a whole; it is only a part thereof. Theology differs because its determinations "draw to other principles" (*trahit ad alia principia*).[52] In other words, theology considers the *credibile* precisely as such, and at the same time in light of principles not of faith, but of understanding.[53] Theology adds to the *credibile*—specifically, it adds *rationes probantes*, "proving reasons," so that what is held is held not only on the

---

[49] Aristotle adds that many sciences display this relationship at times, though not continuously. Medicine in general has little to do with geometry; however, "it is the physician's business to know that circular wounds heal more slowly, the geometer's to know the reason why" (*Posterior Analytics*, bk. 1, ch. 13 [trans. G.R.G. Mure, in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: 1941), 131]).

[50] Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence*, 472–76.

[51] For Aquinas, theology is subalternated to the *scientia Dei et beatorum*, for the articles of faith, which are accepted as the principles of theology, are known better (i.e., more as the "reasoned fact") by God and the blessed (though see M.V. Dougherty, "On the Alleged Subalternate Character of Sacra Doctrina in Aquinas," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 77 [2004]: 101–110). Bonaventure says rather that theology is subalternated to scripture. The "articles of faith" may be equated with scripture, as the articulation of the revealed truth thereof (see below, on theological authorities); and Bonaventure's description of the formal object of scripture—*credibile ut credibile*—accords well with the idea of the articles of faith, held precisely in faith. There is no doubt that both Bonaventure and Aquinas see theology as subalternated to revelation. But a question that begs to be asked is whether the difference between the historical specificity of scripture and the abstraction of the articles has an impact on the form of theology.

[52] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2 (1, 9–11). See Tavard, *Transiency*, 137–40; LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom*, 44–60.

[53] Donneaud sees here the influence of Robert Grosseteste's commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* (Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence*, 476–79).

basis of authority, but also on the basis of reason.[54] Reason does not give a higher knowledge of the things of faith, as it would if it achieved the "reasoned fact," but a knowledge that gives an account of the things of faith that is intelligible to reason, which always stands under the authority of revelation.[55]

Bonaventure's move here accords very well with the nature of *iste liber*—the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. Lombard's determinations, like those of other early scholastics, are produced in a dialectical exercise, where different opinions are set forth, compared to one another, and the question settled by the determination of a master.[56] The method is one that does not necessarily issue in demonstration, for the material of the determination is not certain principles, but the opinions (*sententiae*) of the fathers. What Bonaventure sees here is a theology that can come to certain understanding when there is unanimity among the witnesses, or when it is a question that can be answered fully in light of naturally knowable principles; but when these are lacking, the master is left only with the most probable reason, and any further certitude can come only from faith itself.

One may be tempted to read Bonaventure's doctrine here as corresponding to a later idea of a "theological conclusion": that is, that the proper mode of theology is syllogistic demonstration, in which one principle comes from faith and the other comes from reason.[57] Surely this is a likely interpretation of the language of two sets of principles in this response. In opposition to this, though, is the very next response to an objection in this question.[58] The objection is that the material of theology surpasses the reason, and so the mode of proceeding should not be according to the reason. Bonaventure admits the cogency of this argument, but responds that the reason used in theology is not that of an acquired science, but a reason elevated by faith and the gifts of knowledge and understanding. There is an ambiguity in the *Sentences* commentary

---

[54] See I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 1, ad 5–6 (1, 8): Faith assents to the First Truth itself; scripture adds to this the "reason of authority"; but *iste liber* adds "proving reasons"—meaning not that the reasons given actually demonstrate the truth of the things of faith, but that they deal with those things under the aspect of their intelligibility.

[55] If an understanding of the reasoned fact is possible, it pertains to the higher spiritual intellectual gifts.

[56] See Monti, "Introduction," xxv.

[57] See Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P., *A History of Theology*, trans. and ed. Hunter Guthrie (Garden City, N.Y.: 1968), 154–62.

[58] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2, ad 5 (1, 11).

in the expression *rationes probantes* which describes the contribution of reason.[59] Generically, it means the arguments that one can adduce in favor of something that is held in faith. Specifically, it runs the gamut from the merely probable to the most demonstrative arguments. In its least proper sense, it refers to the contribution of a reason that operates entirely separately from faith.[60]

This ambiguity opens up to one of the great points of development in Bonaventure's theological methodology. At the beginning of his writing career, he explicitly states the principle that theology requires the use of a reason that is transformed by grace. How this transformation happens, and what theology is able to produce as a result, comes to be understood by Bonaventure more and more deeply as time goes by.

Bonaventure's solution here is precisely the sort of thing that led the authors of the *Summa halensis* and Odo Rigaud to deny a scientific status to theology. Yet in itself it has an important provenance among Bonaventure's predecessors, most famously Anselm's "necessary reasons," intelligible principles known by a transformed reason.[61] The result is a demonstrative science of theology.[62]

The Structure of Theology as a Whole

In addition to the structure of theological knowledge in specific arguments, the question of the science of theology pertains to the way in which theological treatises as a whole are structured. Bonaventure's systematic theological works display at least three distinct organizing principles. The structure of certain works is, of course, inescapable because of the subject: thus, the structure of the commentary on the *Sentences* follows Lombard's text, and the collations *De septem donis Spiritus sancti* follow the order of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Yet even here, Bonaventure makes distinctive organizational choices.[63]

---

[59] See, e.g., III *Sent.*, d. 24, a. 2, q. 2 (3, 520–521).

[60] See II *Sent.*, d. 30, a. 1, q. 1 (2, 714–717).

[61] See below for specific styles of argumentation in Bonaventure.

[62] For different judgments on the possibility of demonstration in Bonaventure's theology, see Arosio, "Credibile ut intelligibile"; Emmanuel Falque, "The Phenomenological Act of *perscrutatio* in the *proemium* of Bonaventure's *Commentary on the Sentences*," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 10 (2001): 1–22.

[63] Hayes is certainly right to deny that the difference in structure of the early and late works is that the former are properly theological, the latter properly pastoral ("Bonaventure," 52).

One structure is that of emanation and return,[64] found especially in the *Breviloquium* and *De scientia Christi.*[65] Notably, both of these texts are divided into seven parts: three pertaining to the divine pole of the topic,[66] one focused on the human point of contact with the divine,[67] and three on the transformation of the human and its reorientation to God.[68] Such a structure reflects the whole of our salvation, displaying at every point *nostra metaphysica* (*Hex.* 1.17) and our proper and multiform relation to God. The center point in such a structure is critical. It marks the turning point, the beginning of our explicit return to God. It is also, in Bonaventure, invariably Christological. As Christ is the midpoint of the Trinity, and the center of all knowledge, so he is always at the turning point.[69]

A second organizational structure is that of ascent, most visible in *De reductione*, the *Itinerarium*, and the *Hexaëmeron.* The theme of ascent is present also in the first structure, of course, in the *reductio* of the last part of that structure. In these other texts, however, the ascent begins in that which is furthest in the order of being—most diminished—from God, whether the sensible things of creation or the natural knowledge of the world.[70] Such texts present more obvious possibilities for analyzing the relationship between philosophy and theology, though this is not their chief burden. They present Bonaventure's fundamental argument against rationalism, before and during the crisis of radical Aristotelianism at the University of Paris. Such structures display how the world is theophanic, and how the transformation wrought by grace creates surprising possibilities for Christian wisdom.

A final major organizational structure is that of the parallel development of natural reason and graced reason. There are two prime examples

---

[64] Cf. *Hex.* 1.17 (5, 332).

[65] Joshua C. Benson, "Structure and Meaning in St. Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi*," *Franciscan Studies* 62 (2004): 76.

[66] *Brev.*: God and his creative activity; *Scien. Chr.*: the divine knowledge.

[67] *Brev.*: the incarnation; *Scien. Chr.*: human cognition in its orientation toward perfection.

[68] *Brev.*: the economy of grace, sacraments, and last things; *Scien. Chr.*: the wisdom of Christ's soul.

[69] Two other works, *De septem donis Spiritus sancti* and the *Hexaëmeron*, based on a division into seven, do not conform to this *emanatio-reductio* pattern—and yet are marked by an "interruption" of the text at the midpoint. In *De septem donis*, this is the collation on Mary and fortitude; in the *Hexaëmeron*, it is collation 19, a kind of methodological reprise that is not strictly part of the treatment of the third day.

[70] Hayes, "Bonaventure," 52: "Bonaventure's theology from the time he left the university is above all the exposition of the ascent of the world back to God."

of this: *De mysterio Trinitatis* and the *Itinerarium.* Instead of an ascent, there is necessarily here an oscillation, in which the natural intelligibility of a thing both finds its perfection in something seen through the eyes of faith and leads the soul to the consideration of something further on the natural level.[71] Such texts provide more specific testimony to the relationship of philosophy and theology, for these clearly emerge as distinct ways of regarding the same object. Here, this aspect is more central to the structure, for every time one oscillates back to the natural level, one is reminded that such a natural consideration is possible, and is by no means foreign to Bonaventure's theological project.

Each of these structures allows for a distinctive and progressive ordering of theological knowledge.

Theology as Wisdom

Theology has, both in its particular arguments and in its argumentative sweep, a scientific structure. At the end of the day, however, Bonaventure is less concerned with the scientific character of theology, and more with its sapiential character. This emerges in a striking way in the prologue to the *Commentary on the Sentences*, where Bonaventure insists that theology is neither a speculative nor a practical habit simply, but a combination of both—or better, a single sapiential habit.[72]

The topic of the sapiential character of theology requires a study of two questions: (1) how does "wisdom" describe the perfection of theological knowledge? and (2) how is theology related to other forms of knowledge, both inferior and superior to it?

---

[71] In *De mysterio Trinitatis*, the oscillation is between the first and second articles of each of the first seven questions; in the *Itinerarium*, it is between chs. 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 5 and 6. Hellmann speaks of this in terms of a "basic two-fold schema of vertical order and horizontal order" (*Divine and Created Order*, 25 and *passim*). The vertical order is the order of creation, in which the intellect, operating in the light of nature, sees the order of the creature to God; the horizontal order is the Trinitarian order of Persons which the intellect sees, with the eyes of faith, reflected in the creature. See also Hammond, "Order in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum.*" For an account of this same double pattern that is based on a different sense of the apprehension of God's presence in creatures, see LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom*, 97–116.

[72] Charles Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness in St. Bonaventure* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1999). Carpenter asserts that the final cause is, in Bonaventure's view, the most important of the four causes of theology.

The Perfection of Theological Knowledge

It is possible to interpret the sapiential character of theology in Bonaventure as having to do with the pursuit of theology for the sake of an end that lies beyond theology.[73] In favor of such a view is the undoubted dynamic of those works that follow a pattern of ascent, as well as some of those that proceed according to *emanatio* and *reductio.* Christian wisdom (*Itin.* 7), nulliform wisdom (*Hex.* 2), ecstatic knowledge (*Scien. Chr.*, epilogue): all are states that are clearly beyond the scope of theological science, though that science in each case plays a role in preparation for the end. Moreover, the plain language of the prologue of the *Sentences* commentary, that the loving knowledge of Christ is the end of theology, likewise suggests a *transitus* from the intellectual activity of theology to its affective end.[74]

A different view centers on the Aristotelian framework of the discussion of theology in the *Sentences* commentary.[75] Faced with the possibility of defining theology as a speculative or as a practical science, Bonaventure opts for a third way: theology perfects the intellect as it is extended *ad affectum.*[76] The way this is understood depends on the sense that one gives the final cause, which is the topic of the question. If it is understood as the purpose—the end for the sake of which we undertake theology—then it is possible to say that theology is meant to lead to an end that is extrinsic to its mode of proceeding.[77] If, on the other hand, the final cause is understood as that end which perfects the formal cause—thus, not the end of the one who undertakes the activity, but the proper end of the activity itself—then theology must be governed in an intrinsic way by this extension *ad affectum.* The contrast with speculative and practical sciences is suggestive. A practical science, unlike a speculative science, requires knowledge of its final cause in order to accomplish its work. The speculative science of geometry is guided only by its principles, and

---

[73] See E. Randolph Daniel, "St. Bonaventure a Faithful Disciple of St. Francis? A Reexamination of the Question," in *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974* (Grottaferrata: 1974), ed. Bougerol, vol. 2, 171–87, esp. 183ff. Carpenter argues instead that the end of theology is precisely the same as the end of spirituality (*Theology as the Road to Holiness*, 175–91).

[74] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 3 (1, 12–13). The same ordering of the intellective to the affective can be found in Bonaventure's description of the wisdom that is the gift of the Holy Spirit (III *Sent.*, d. 35, a. un., q. 1 [3, 772–775]).

[75] For the following, see LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom*, 60–65.

[76] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 3 (1, 12–13). Among Bonaventure's contemporaries, Aquinas argues that theology is speculative, Odo that it is practical, and Albert that it is affective.

[77] See Quinn, *Historical Constitution*, 683ff.

deduces whatever it may from them; the practical science of house-building is guided by the requirements of the end—i.e., the qualities of the house that is the *telos* of the activity. By comparison, the end of theology is not an artifact, and so differs from a practical science; but insofar as the end of theology—the love of God in Christ—gives guidance to theology, it differs from a speculative science. Hence the category of affective science, a science in which the relation of love toward its subject plays a role in determining the principles on which the science is based.

Two factors must be added to these considerations, to obtain a fuller picture of what Bonaventure means by the perfection of theology in wisdom. One is that the loving knowledge he describes in the prologue to the *Sentences* commentary regularly enters his properly scientific theological arguments, even in the scholastic commentary on the *Sentences* and *De mysterio Trinitatis*.[78] There is, to be sure, a kind of wisdom toward which theology points, which is fundamentally other than theology; but short of this, there is a theological wisdom that is not so separate from theology.

The other factor to be considered is Bonaventure's descriptions of what appears to be theological wisdom when he speaks of the gift of wisdom.[79] In the *Sentences* it is the "knowledge of God according to piety," which is situated between the "knowledge of eternal things" (or, of the highest cause), which is properly philosophical, and the "experimental knowledge of God," which is the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is the knowledge of God that comes from the apprehension of his revelation[80] according to the powers of the soul transformed by grace, particularly the theological virtues. Bonaventure associates it with the spiritual senses of scripture.

Bonaventure distinguishes between this wisdom and other, lesser forms of wisdom, as between wisdom that is properly so-called and wisdom that is only commonly so-called. In other words, the kind of rest that Bonaventure associates with wisdom is truly present in theological wisdom but not in philosophical wisdom. This highlights the significance of the point already made, that the wisdom that is the perfection of theology must not be collapsed into the ultimate form of wisdom (*sapientia magis proprie*); if it is, then the particular character of theology is lost.

---

[78] See below, on the types of theological arguments.

[79] I.e., III *Sent.*, d. 35, a. un., q. 1 (3, 772–775); *Hex.* 2 (5, 336–342).

[80] For the meaning of *revelatio* in Bonaventure, see Pietro Maranesi, *Verbum inspiratum: Chiave ermeneutica dell'Hexaëmeron di san Bonaventura* (Rome: 1996), 141–45.

Theology and Other Disciplines

A sapiential theology is not an isolated discipline. As distinct from simple faith, theology involves an intellectual elaboration of the things of faith that requires some facility with other disciplines that depend on human reason. Moreover, these disciplines—arts or science—all require the influence of theology in order to reach their proper end. Classic texts in this regard are collations 1 and 4 to 7 of the *Hexaëmeron* (which deal with all branches of philosophy) and the short treatise *De reductione artium ad theologiam* (which deals not only with philosophy, but also with the mechanical arts and sense knowledge).

Bonaventure is certainly heir to an Augustinian understanding of theology as the pinnacle of an ordered system of human knowledge. His systematic reflections on the subject deal chiefly with one aspect of this: the dependence of other disciplines on theology for their right understanding. There is little said about how theology requires other disciplines, or how they lead up to theology.[81]

To understand this, one must recognize the relative autonomy of the other disciplines. Every form of human knowledge has a light whereby it is able to achieve that knowledge. There is such a thing as the "light of nature," and a discipline operating within that light achieves a proper natural knowledge. To say that such knowledge is autonomous is to say that it has, strictly speaking, no need of theology. Any influence of theology will be extrinsic. For example, one might say that the intellect of the natural knower is darkened by sin, and thus needs the light of grace to know some things that, in principle, it can know in the light of nature. Or, natural reason may not be able to decide between two equally plausible conclusions; if the truth of one is known through revelation, faith can give the answer to the natural question. Or again, some natural disciplines, such as ethics and metaphysics, deal with matters of ultimate concern (the human good, God), and theology can, because of its insight into precisely those matters, judge the principles of the natural knowledge.

All of these are ways to describe possible relationships between theology and natural disciplines. Bonaventure acknowledges them[82] but pushes the matter further. All of these are extrinsic influences of theology

---

[81] *De don. Spir.* 4.12 (5, 475–476) is almost cryptic: "philosophy is the way to the other [i.e., higher] sciences."

[82] See esp. *Hex.* 7 (5, 365–368).

on natural knowledge; Bonaventure instead talks about the intrinsic influence. Natural knowledge is natural in the sense of relying on the natural light of reason, but that natural light is intrinsically related to a supernatural light (*Red. art.*) or the medium of Christ (*Hex.* 1). This does not mean that, for example, the mathematician is always talking about Christ. But the natural reality is determined according to the supernatural reality, and so the fullest knowledge of the natural requires the knowledge of the supernatural.

The famous debate about the status of Bonaventure's philosophy was resolved precisely in this fashion. Etienne Gilson and Fernand van Steenberghen argued on speculative and historical grounds over whether Bonaventure can be said to have a philosophy distinct from his theology. Zachary Hayes offered the following resolution.[83] For Bonaventure, the end of philosophy is the knowledge of the exemplary cause of things. The philosopher who is true to his science knows that that is what he is looking for. The philosopher also knows that God contains this exemplary cause, but because he does not know the Trinity, he does not know this cause clearly. The theologian, on the other hand, does know the Trinity. He knows that the second Person of the Trinity is the complete self-expression of the Father. Moreover, the second Person—whom Bonaventure prefers to identify as the Word—is the principle for any expression of God outside of himself, in the finite realm. In other words, the principle of creation is the Word of God, and this Word is the exemplary cause of all that is. The philosopher knows that philosophical wisdom involves a grasp of the exemplary cause of things. But this wisdom is not achieved until theology supplies its own understanding of the Trinity. Although a philosophical science is possible and appropriate—thinking about things in the natural light of human reason—the perfection of philosophy lies beyond its grasp. Philosophy always longs for a fulfillment that it cannot achieve on its own.

Theology as wisdom thus stands above every other discipline because what it knows is determinative for them. This is not unlike Aquinas's explanation that theology "judges the principles" of other sciences,[84] but it extends the point. It is not only subordinate disciplines like ethics and

---

[83] Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics." See also Gregory F. LaNave, "God, Creation, and the Possibility of Philosophical Wisdom: The Perspectives of Bonaventure and Aquinas," *Theological Studies* 69 (2008): 812–33.

[84] Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* I, q. 1, a. 6.

metaphysics that are judged by theology; all disciplines are so judged, for they are all intrinsically related to what theology knows.

Because he is drawn to the ontological connection of the branches of human knowledge "coming down from the Father of lights," Bonaventure gives less explicit attention to the propaedeutic value of the subordinate disciplines.[85] Yet a key principle may be adduced: namely, the disposition inherent in lower forms to be perfected by higher forms.[86] This is an important part of his account of the created order. Any form perfects its recipient in some degree, but it also disposes the recipient to the reception of a yet higher form. Therefore, epistemologically, it is not enough to say that theology provides the insight the lower disciplines lack; theology draws them up to itself by drawing higher forms of knowledge out of lower.

This is the best way to understand Bonaventure's diatribe against the defects of reason.[87] No one is faulted for pursuing the knowledge appropriate to his illumination; and a philosopher may be excused for his mistakes if he was lacking the knowledge of revelation. However, one is not excused for refusing to allow for the upward dynamic of natural knowledge. This is to falsify natural knowledge itself.

The Theologian

Bonaventure closes his examination of the four causes of theology in the commentary on the *Sentences* by asking: Who is the efficient cause, or the author, of theology? To raise the question in this setting is unusual, but perhaps fitting for a Franciscan friar of the time, faced with division in the order between those who found it proper for Franciscans to be trained in scholastic theology and those who regarded studies at Paris as a betrayal of the ideals of Assisi. Moreover, Bonaventure shows himself conscious of the Augustinian patrimony passed down through monastic theology,

---

[85] On the division of the disciplines, see DiMaio, "La divisione"; on the ordering of the disciplines to theology, see Quinn, *Historical Constitution*, 723–86.

[86] As Kent Emery points out, Bonaventure disagrees with Augustine on this point. For Bonaventure, the progression of creation according to the gradual educement of higher forms is a mark of God's wisdom; Kent Emery, Jr., "Reading the World Rightly and Squarely: Bonaventure's Doctrine of the Cardinal Virtues," *Traditio* 39 (1983): 183–218.

[87] E.g., *Hex.* 5.21 (5, 357). After laying out at length the nature, division, and order of the parts of philosophy in their proper functioning, Bonaventure says, "But in all these things, reason went on a rampage, metaphysics ran riot."

according to which the master of theology is Christ.[88] Therefore, it is a matter requiring some distinctions, so as to make clear the identity of the theologian, his place, and the qualities he must possess.

In the *Sentences* commentary, Bonaventure evinces a high regard for the learned men with whom he studied at Paris. It is Alexander, rather than Francis, to whom he refers as his "father."[89] Yet not *all magistri* can be called authors of the theology that is present in their writings.

Christ is the one teacher of theology, as he is of all truth.[90] The author who truly has the *habitus* of theology, and passes it on verbally or in the written word, is subordinate to Christ.[91] Because he truly has this *habitus* of theology, attained by much study and prayer, he is able to compose a theological text whose doctrine is truly his own.[92] His activity is different from that of the scribe, the compiler, and the commentator. Most telling is the difference between the commentator and the author. The former writes down the words of others, and only adds his own to elucidate their teaching; the latter, by contrast, writes down primarily his own words, and adds the words of others only to confirm his teaching.

Bonaventure's praise of the genius of those who possess the habit of theology is accompanied by recognition of their place in a whole theological order. Peter Lombard's copious use of authorities does not take away from his own theology, but confirms it by the exhibition of his humility.[93] In *Hex.* 19, Bonaventure lays out a whole program for the study of theology. Scripture is read first and foremost, then the fathers. If there are things that are unclear in these sources, one may have recourse to the masters (the Summists), and, if need be and with proper caution, the philosophers.[94]

---

[88] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 4, obj. 1 (1, 15). See also *Christus unus omnium magister* 24 (5, 573).

[89] II *Sent.*, prae. (2, 1–3).

[90] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 4, obj. 1 (1, 15). Bonaventure quotes Augustine here, *In Epist. Joannis* 3.13 (*PL* 35:2004–5). See Bonaventure, *Christus unus omnium magister* (5, 567–574).

[91] See *Chr. Mag.* 24 (5, 573).

[92] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 4, ad 2 (1, 15). Bonaventure compares the possession of a *habitus* of theology to speaking good Latin: there is a difference between merely copying those who know how to do it and really knowing the art oneself.

[93] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 4, ad 2 (1, 15).

[94] *Hex.* 19.6–12 (5, 421–422). Bonaventure's expressed concern here is to exhort the theologian, influenced by the works of the modern masters, to return to the source of his doctrine. Bonaventure, *Hex.* 19.11 (5, 422): "As a man would be foolish always to deal with commentaries without ever going up to an [original] text, so would he be also in dealing with the summas of masters."

Theology requires, as noted above, a subalternation to faith. The idea of subordination to the teaching of Christ continues this theme, for that subordination occurs only through faith. Subordination to the fathers is also required for theology to be a science, but this is related more to the unity of the science. For Bonaventure, the witness of the fathers is one thing; only rarely do they differ essentially in their opinions. It is one of the elements of the firmness of the faith.[95] Unity in meaning is the desire of all Christian teachers,[96] and Bonaventure's exhortation to any contemporary theologian is that, in interpreting scripture and the fathers, he should always adhere to the more common way.[97] The *magister* who would be a theologian must therefore strike a balance between his proper subordination to and humility in the face of the authorities and the need for his theology to be his own. This very dynamic is evident in Bonaventure's work as, in the midst of producing a genuinely original piece of theology, he speaks of himself as a mere commentator or compiler.[98]

The requisite qualities of a theologian do not end at the *habitus* of theology and its attendant humility. Bonaventure's doctrine of sanctifying grace presents many elements that are pertinent to his understanding of the nature of theology.[99] Specific habits, such as the virtue of faith and the gifts of knowledge and understanding, are indispensable.[100] Nor is it only the intellectual habits that are significant: the affective gift of piety is likewise necessary,[101] and the gift of wisdom is a mixture of the affective and the intellectual. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are perhaps more pertinent to the task of theology than the virtues or beatitudes, for while the virtues rectify the soul and the beatitudes perfect it, the gifts have especially to do with the advancement of the soul, which, intellectually, involves the transition from believing revelation to understanding it.[102]

In addition, theology is influenced by the relation between different aspects of sanctifying grace. Each of the virtues disposes the soul to the

---

[95] *Hex.* 9.22 (5, 375).

[96] See *Chr. Mag.* 26 (5, 573–574).

[97] *Hex.* 19.11 (5, 422).

[98] II *Sent.*, praelocutio (2, 1–3); *Legenda major* prol. 3 (8, 505); see also *Brev.* prol. 6 (5, 207–208), where he minimizes the significance of his authorship of that work.

[99] For a summary on this point, see LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom*, 75–85. See also Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness*, 125–73.

[100] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2, ad 5 (1, 11). See Quinn, *Historical Constitution*, 685.

[101] *De don. Spir.* 3.17 (5, 472–473): "If you would be true scholars, you must have piety." See esp. Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness*, 152–57.

[102] See Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness*, 125; Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*, 111.

reception of a corresponding gift, and each gift to the reception of a corresponding beatitude. There is also an influence of the gifts upon each other: the higher gifts rule or guide the lower gifts, while the lower gifts execute; and the use of the lower gifts facilitates the use of the higher.[103] Finally, in the doctrine of the spiritual senses (which Bonaventure defines as the acts of the grace of the beatitudes) there is evidence of a directive influence of the soul's "sense" for the divine on its exercise of the lower gifts.

There are other virtues necessary for the practice of theology as well. Bonaventure's commendation of a *modus perscrutatorius* for theology is accompanied by a recognition and denunciation of the evil of "curiosity"—that is, to desire to know simply to satisfy the craving for knowledge.[104] Opposed to this evil is the virtue of *studiositas*,[105] which may be further delineated into the dispositions of order, assiduity, satisfaction, and due proportion, all oriented toward a life that is reverent, pure, religious, and edifying.[106] Bonaventure's admonitions on this point take on a particular character when he considers the figure of Francis. If *studiositas* is the disposition that properly guides the student's investigations, conformity—meaning, a life thoroughly configured to Christ—is the disposition that allows the saint properly to penetrate the divine mysteries.

The uplifting and transforming effect of grace can affect the theologian's grasp of the terms used in theology.[107] It also allows one to make determinations in arguments *ex pietate*.[108] This approach raises the possibility that the same argument could be regarded by one person as a persuasive argument *ex convenientia*, while it is regarded by another as a strict argument from necessity.

The argument up to this point seems to presume that the theologian properly speaking is the school-trained thinker. But such a presumption must be validated. The very fact that theology is affected by the transformation of the theologian in grace raises the possibility that one who

---

[103] III *Sent.*, d. 34, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2 (3, 747–749); cf. *Brev.* 5.5 (5, 257–258).

[104] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2, ad 1–3 (1, 11). See Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness*, 144ff.

[105] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2, ad 1–3 (1, 11); *Tri. quaes. mag.* 11–12 (8, 335).

[106] *Hex.* 19.6–23 (5, 421–424).

[107] See III *Sent.* d. 24, a. 2, q. 3 (3, 521–524); Tim Noone and R.E. Houser argue that Bonaventure's version of Anselm's ontological argument depends on a proper understanding of what is signified in the name "God" (Noone and Houser, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [published on-line in 2005;], s.v. "Bonaventure."

[108] See below, on the different types of theological arguments.

possesses, for example, the gifts of understanding and wisdom can simply by that fact be a theologian. This point has been highlighted by Joseph Ratzinger. Ratzinger has argued that, however much Bonaventure was willing to acknowledge in his earliest works the legitimacy of scholastic theology, his view changed dramatically as he developed his theology of history. In the *Hexaëmeron*, Ratzinger contends, Bonaventure envisaged a coming age of the church in which theology would be the province not of the learned *magistri*, but of the simple, of whom Francis was the type.[109] E. Randolph Daniel, on the other hand, suggests that Bonaventure regards academic theology as a proper discipline that is meant to lead its practitioner to the threshold of the mystical *transitus* that is the end of the Franciscan itinerary.[110] Whatever the correct resolution of this question, the disputants agree that, for Bonaventure, (1) the qualities one finds in the saint are valuable, and indeed necessary for theology; (2) Francis' experience marks a change in the conception of theology; and (3) in some sense, Francis himself may legitimately be called a theologian.

One may, for any great theologian, find one or more distinctive insights that shape his theology. In the case of theologians who belong to a religious order, one may expect that the charism of the order, or particular teachings of its founder, will have a strong influence on their theology. This is quite obviously the case among the Franciscans, and Bonaventure is no exception.[111] Indeed, his view of the influence of grace seems to require it. Francis' view of God as simply "good" becomes in Bonaventure the way to understand the Trinity, Christ, creation, and consummation.[112]

---

[109] Ratzinger, *The Theology of History*, 155–59.

[110] E. Randolph Daniel, "St. Bonaventure a Faithful Disciple of St. Francis? A Reexamination of the Question," in *S. Bonaventura*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol, vol. 2, 171–87, esp. 183ff. See also idem, "St. Bonaventure Defender of Franciscan Eschatology," in Bougerol, ed., *S. Bonaventura*, vol. 4, 793–806. Indirect support for Daniel's position may be found in Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness*, 71–76. On the importance of the *transitus* in Bonaventure's thought, see Werner Hülsbusch, "Die Theologie des Transitus bei Bonaventura," in Bougerol, ed., *S. Bonaventura*, vol. 4, 533–65.

[111] See Michael W. Blastic, O.F.M.Conv., " 'It Pleases Me That You Should Teach Sacred Theology': Franciscans Doing Theology," *Franciscan Studies* 55 (1998): 1–25; Bernard McGinn, "The Influence of St. Francis on the Theology of the High Middle Ages: The Testimony of St. Bonaventure," in *Bonaventuriana: Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol OFM*, ed. Francisco de Asís Chavero Blanco, O.F.M., 2 vols. (Bibliotheca Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani) 27–28 (Rome: 1988), vol. 1, 97–117.

[112] It has become common to talk about Bonaventure's "metaphysics of the good." See Ewert H. Cousins, "Response to Zachary Hayes," *The Journal of Religion* 58 supplement (1978): 97–104; Ilia Delio, "Bonaventure's Metaphysics of the Good," *Theological Studies* 60 (1999): 228–46.

Yet in what sense can one push the matter further, and identify Francis, the poor man of Assisi, as a theologian?[113] The texts where such a claim is in play are the *Hexaëmeron* and the *Legenda maior*. In both, Francis is presented as the type of a penetrating understanding of scripture that goes beyond the speculations of the trained theologians and incorporates the saint into the dynamic of God's *revelatio.* Bonaventure does not argue that Francis surpasses the theologians at their own activity; insofar as theology is a structured activity building on the *rationes probantes*, Francis is not a theologian. But one must also notice that both the *Legenda major* and the *Hexaëmeron* emphasize the visibility, or the legibility, of Francis' work. He gives expression to the inner heart of the faith—through the Rule, his virtues, and the stigmata in the *Legenda maior*;[114] through his historical place as herald and member of the order of spiritual men in the *Hexaëmeron.*[115] One may say that insofar as the saint produces a visible expression of his understanding of revelation, he is in some sense a theologian.

Theological Authorities

Theology is based in the *credibile.* Though all fields of knowledge are brought into theology,[116] its source is the *credibile* as such.[117] And the source by which the *credibile* as such is made known to us is sacred scripture.

Bonaventure offers two different descriptions of the way that the *credibile*, and as a result theology, are based in scripture. When he is particularly concerned to denote the scientific character of theology, he speaks of the *credibile* as a set of known things which are submitted to a process of reasoning.[118] In the background here is William of Auxerre's comparison of the articles of faith to the first principles of a science.[119] In this

---

[113] Describing a saint as a theologian is not at all unusual in the thirteenth century. What is perhaps striking about Bonaventure's claim about Francis is that one can find some justification for it even in light of his explanation of theology as a science.

[114] *Leg. Maior* 4.4 (8, 513–514), 10 (8, 533–535); 13.1–3 (8, 542–543); and the treatment of Francis's virtues in *Leg. Maior* 5–12 (8, 516–542).

[115] *Hex.* 22.22–23 (5, 440–441). For comments on the meaning of "spiritual men" (*viri spirituals*) among the Franciscans at the time, see David Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after St. Francis* (University Park, Pa.: 2001), 39–41.

[116] *Red. art.* 26 (5, 325).

[117] *Brev.* 1.1: "Credibile ut credibile" (5, 210).

[118] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2, ad 4; (1, 11); cf. *Hex.* 10.3 (5, 377); I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 1, ad 5–6 (1, 8).

[119] See *De don. Spir.* 4.13 (5, 476).

simple sense, scripture gives us certain definable material knowledge that we attempt to understand. In other contexts, Bonaventure associates the *credibile* with the allegorical sense of scripture. The allegorical sense tells us what we must believe, and thereby establishes the things of faith that are the material of theology.[120] It is the particular concern of the doctors.[121]

There is an apparent discrepancy between these descriptions, in their view of the adequacy of the literal sense and the necessity of the allegorical sense. One sees here a difference between the *Breviloquium* and the *Hexaëmeron*. Both works speak of the necessity of becoming well acquainted with the literal meaning of scripture, without which one cannot rise to its spiritual interpretation.[122] But whereas the principles of interpretation laid down in the *Breviloquium* (following Augustine) favor an appeal to the literal sense, Bonaventure in the *Hexaëmeron* excoriates those who are content with the literal sense. Furthermore, the perfection of theology, in theological wisdom, clearly requires the spiritual understanding of scripture.[123]

The two perspectives can be reconciled as follows. The particular elements of the *credibile* that serve as principles for theology are derived from the literal sense. This is true whether they are considered to be the twelve creedal articles of faith or the twelve "thoughts" that are given by faith.[124] All of these come from those parts of scripture that speak of things pertinent to our salvation, in clear words.[125] But in order to see that these particular elements express the whole essence of revelation—that they are truly *articles* of faith—one has to be able to read other parts of scripture with an eye to the allegorical (or more generally spiritual) sense. As Ratzinger points out, Bonaventure uses the word *revelatio* not to describe the written text of scripture, but that which results when scripture is spiritually understood.[126] The reception of revelation requires being formed by the spiritual sense. The doctors should labor especially at the allegorical sense because they wish to identify how the different parts of scripture all attest to what we must believe, but this is different from establishing

---

[120] *Red. art.* 5 (5, 321); *Hex.* 2.13 (5, 338).
[121] *Red. art.* 5 (5, 321).
[122] *Brev.* prol. 6 (5, 207–208); *Hex.* 19.7–8 (5, 421).
[123] *Hex.* 2.13ff. (5, 338ff.)
[124] *De don. Spir.* 4.13 (5, 476); *Hex.* 10.3 (5, 377).
[125] *Brev.* prol. 6.2 (5, 207–208).
[126] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 62.

the *credibile* (in the sense of the principles of theology) on the basis of the allegorical sense.

When we turn from the foundation of theology to the process of making theological determinations, the same distinction is evident. The understanding that comes from scripture as a whole is "almost infinite," or at least "manifold."[127] It has a spiritual purpose of leading us to our perfection. There are indeed particular things revealed in scripture that it is impossible to know without the allegorical sense (or the anagogical sense). Foremost among these is the significance of history.[128] The correspondences between times in creation, in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament, and their foreshadowing of times in the post-biblical era church, are unknowable without the spiritual sense.[129] It is not clear whether Bonaventure considers these correspondences as "necessary for our salvation," and thus whether they belong to the more limited sense of the *credibile.* Certainly, one must believe in God's provident care of the universe, and this is not apparent unless one considers the course of the universe as a whole.[130] But it is perhaps sufficient to consider the course of history as it is apparent literally in scripture. More broadly, one can say that a question concerning something of the *credibile* that is stated in plain words does not require one to advert to the spiritual sense in order to make a resolution.[131]

Ratzinger notes, appropriately, that in Bonaventure's full understanding of *revelatio*, it does not terminate with the writing of the sacred text. The reception of the text in faith and the subsequent penetration of its meaning is also *revelatio.*[132] The normative examples of this are the councils and the saints and doctors.[133] The place of the councils is evident: they confirm the truth about matters that had been in doubt.[134] The "saints and doctors" are those individuals who are "wise with the knowledge of things worldly or divine."[135] Though their testimony is individual, its value is its harmony with the rest of these individuals. One can point to outstanding

---

[127] *Hex.* 15.10 (5, 400).
[128] See Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 62–63.
[129] See *Brev.* prol. 2 (5, 203–204); *Hex.* 15–16 (5, 398–408); see also *Leg. maj.*, prol. (8, 504–505).
[130] *Brev.* prol. 2 (5, 203–204).
[131] See Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence*, 195.
[132] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 67.
[133] *Hex.* 9.19 (5, 375).
[134] *Hex.* 9.21 (5, 375).
[135] *Hex.* 9.22 (5, 375).

examples of different kinds of insight into revelation,[136] but it is the witness of the whole, the agreement of the saints among themselves, that lays out the "common way" that is most authoritative for the theologian.

Among the wise—the "saints and doctors"—one can distinguish several groups, who form a descending scale of authority for the theologian. First are the fathers of the church. Not only are these valuable; they are virtually necessary for understanding certain things about scripture.[137] Second are those holy men who came after the period of the fathers and yet are closely assimilated to the fathers in the excellence of their understanding—for example, Anselm, Bernard, Richard of St Victor, and Hugh of St Victor.[138] Third are the "Summists," the latter-day learned masters of theology. Their chief role lies in explaining and reconciling the problems that emerge from the writings of the fathers.[139] One cannot be sure that their work is free of error. That is another reason why the unanimity of their witness is important.[140] Finally, there are the philosophers. Their testimony is suspect insofar as they are not enlightened by faith, and all the more so insofar as they explicitly reject the illumination of faith in their philosophy. Yet they hold a place among the wise, for they do possess a true knowledge of things natural and (in some instances) even divine.[141]

Theological Argument

When Bonaventure identifies the mode of proceeding in theology as *perscrutatorius*, he formally distinguishes theology from those forms of Christian discourse that rely on the *modus authenticus*, which subsumes under it narrative, precept, prohibition, exhortation, etc.[142] This means, as shown above, that theology bears a scientific form. It also means that, while it will pursue the same end as scripture, it will do so in a different mode, which is one of argumentation. Sometimes this will occur in the

---

[136] See esp. *Red. art.* 5 (5, 321), with the examples of those who excel as doctors, preachers, or contemplatives.

[137] Bonaventure speaks explicitly about the fathers having received revelation from God (*Hex.* 19.10 [5, 421–422]).

[138] *Red. art.* 5 (5, 321).

[139] *Hex.* 19.10 (5, 421–422).

[140] Bonaventure justifies his disagreements with Lombard because the latter sometimes departs from the "common way" (II *Sent.*, praelocutio [2, 1–3]).

[141] *Hex.* 19.12–14 (5, 422); cf. *Hex.* 4.1 (5, 349), and indeed *Hex.* 4–5 inclusive (5, 348–359).

[142] I *Sent.*, prooem., q. 2 (1, 9–11); *Brev.* pro. 5 (5, 206–207).

typically scholastic dialectical exercise of the *quaestio*, as in the commentary on the *Sentences* and the three sets of disputed questions. Sometimes it will occur in more straightforwardly demonstrative works such as the *Itinerarium*, the *Breviloquium, De reductione artium ad theologiam*, and the three sets of collations.[143]

The parameters for theological argument are conditioned by several factors, namely, the purpose of theology and the nature of its object. The purpose of theology is laid out in qu. 1–3 of the prologue to bk. 1 of the *Sentences* commentary. Theology is meant to see the intelligibility of what God has revealed, which promotes the faith in three ways: (1) refuting the enemies of the faith, (2) strengthening those who are beginners, and (3) adding to the joy of the more perfect. It stems from and leads to the love of Christ. The nature of the object of theology is the transcendent God, about whom we must talk with our limited concepts and according to limited realities. This means, for example, that our theology cannot make the sorts of deductions about God that it could if it fully understood him.

Bonaventure readily includes in his theological works arguments that are strictly speaking philosophical—considering things insofar as they are knowable in the natural light of human reason. Such arguments are suitable to the theological project insofar as they allow one to provide an *apologia* for the faith against its enemies and insofar as beginners find consolation and the perfect rejoice in the fullest possible natural knowledge of things as they pertain to the faith. Examples of these things are the existence of God, the unity of his nature, the attributes of that nature, his causal relationship with respect to creation (efficient, exemplary, final), and the things that flow from that relationship (e.g., that the world is not eternal; that knowing the truth of things requires adverting to God's knowledge of them; that the human soul reaches an end in its relationship to God, and is not perpetually reincarnated). Faith may play an extrinsic role in clarifying the intellect's knowledge of these things, but because it is not brought into play as an intrinsic part of that knowledge, the arguments remain philosophical.[144]

Theological arguments are a blend of two kinds of knowledge: the knowledge of revelation, assented to in faith, and the knowledge of

---

[143] This is not to say that such works are simply exercises in demonstration. For example, Hughes has argued that the *Hexaëmeron* is both argumentative and exhortative (Hughes, "St. Bonaventure's *Collationes*").

[144] See esp. *De don Spir.* 4.6–12 (5, 474–475); *Hex.* 4–7 (5, 348–368). See Christopher M. Cullen, *Bonaventure* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 33–35; LaNave, "Bonaventure's *De Deo uno.*"

the created order and those things that can be known on the basis of the created order. In order to grasp the nature and function of Bonaventure's properly theological arguments, one must highlight certain elements of his conception of the structure of the created order and the revealed order. With respect to the created order, every created thing may be understood both in itself and in its source. The latter is especially important. Mutable things cannot be known with certitude in themselves, for their mutability contravenes any certitude one might claim to have about them. Certitude requires adverting to the divine Ideas.[145] With respect to the revealed order, God invariably makes himself known through Christ; all of revelation is able to be seen in Christ.[146] With this in mind, we may distinguish four typical theological arguments used by Bonaventure.[147]

Reductio[148]

The argument by *reductio* is based on insight into the dependency of one reality on another. The dependent reality is not fully intelligible in itself; it must be understood in light of that on which it is dependent. This dependency is not simply a matter of one thing being the efficient cause of another; it has to do with some degree of similarity between the two. Thus an artifact is not reduced to the craftsman, but it is reducible to the idea whereby the craftsman produces it. Broadly speaking, the *reductio* leads from what is imperfect to what is perfect, or from what is incomplete to what is complete. Bonaventure speaks of a *reductio* of operations to substance, privations to the dispositions they affect, complements of a substance to the substance itself, the mutable to the immutable, the relative to the absolute, etc.[149]

With Bonaventure's emphasis on exemplarity, a wide field of application is opened up for arguments by *reductio.* For example, while a theologian may talk about a particular virtue in light of the way it perfects its subject, or in terms of its object, he may also, by an argument by

---

[145] See *Scien. Chr.*, q. 4 (5, 17–27); *Chr. mag.* (5, 567–574); on certitude in Bonaventure, see Andreas Speer, "The Certainty and Scope of Knowledge: Bonaventure's Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 3 (1993): 35–61.

[146] See above on the application of this to the whole Christ, the uncreated Word, the incarnate Word, the inspired Word, and the crucified Word.

[147] See Bougerol, *Introduction*, 140–58; Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence*, 156–63, 201–11.

[148] See Guy-H. Allard, "La technique de la 'reductio' chez Bonaventure," in Bougerol, ed., *S. Bonaventura*, vol. 2, 395–416.

[149] For a more extensive list, see Allard, "La technique," 399–403.

reductio, talk about it in terms of the exemplary virtue to which it may be compared, and on which, because of the relationship of exemplarity, it ultimately depends. So too, states of life in the church may be seen by *reductio* in terms of a hierarchy that reflects the angelic hierarchy, and ultimately the divine hierarchy.[150]

Similarly, one can talk about the perfection of a body in terms of the seminal reasons inherent in it which are reduced to act by an external agent. Therefore, the intelligibility of the body can be seen to lie in the perfection of the agent or in the potency of the seminal reasons. This is particularly important in Bonaventure's doctrine of creation, where the intelligibility of the six days of creation is not seen unless one sees it as an unfolding of seminal reasons under the influence of light, and therefore as a manifestation of God's wisdom.[151]

Proportion

Not every relationship between two orders comes from a dependency of the one on the other. Frequently, one can only identify a likeness between them without making any stronger causal claim. In such cases, one is limited to saying that one reality, in its own order, represents another reality in its own order. A "limitation" it may be, but it also the source of some of the richest and most distinctive parts of Bonaventure's theology.

Bonaventure is most certainly an heir to the Platonic insight that to penetrate the meaning of things is to move from the visible to the invisible, from the temporal to the eternal, etc. He easily takes up from his patristic heritage the idea of the spiritual senses of scripture—both that scripture has such senses, and that they are the greater truth of scripture. Truly to understand scripture requires one to move from the literal to the spiritual sense. What is evident on the literal level is meant to point to a higher, spiritual truth. Indeed, the true meaning of scripture is virtually infinite.[152] The literal meaning is not brought back by *reductio* to the spiritual, for there is not that kind of dependency between them. Instead, the analogy between them is one of proportionality.

---

[150] See *Hex.* 20–23 (5, 424–449). By "divine hierarchy" Bonaventure does not mean an order of superiority among the divine Persons, but a multiplicity that emerges from the relations of the Persons (the Father as Father, the Father in relation to the Son, the Father in relation to the Holy Spirit, the Son as Son, etc.).

[151] See Emery, "Reading the World," esp. 183–97.

[152] See *De don. Spir.* 4.15 (5, 476); *Hex.* 15.10 (5, 400).

As in the book of scripture, so is it also in the book of the world. Every essence, every substance, points to God according to Bonaventure's doctrine of "universal analogy"—that is, one can find in them a triple distinction of elements that represents the Trinity.[153] And just as in reading scripture one who stops with the literal sense (true sense though it is) fails to see the full intelligibility of scripture, so too one who regards creatures simply in themselves without attending to the way in which they represent the deeper mystery of God fails to see their full intelligibility.

Necessary Reasons

Bonaventure takes from Anselm and others the doctrine of "necessary reasons." This is, in a sense, the heart of the theological endeavor, for the search for necessary reasons is simply the search for the intelligibility of the datum of faith. Clearly, for Bonaventure, since revelation comes from the Supreme Truth, it is intrinsically intelligible. That intelligibility may, on certain points and in limited ways, be accessible in the natural light of human reason, whether by necessary conclusions of strict philosophical demonstrations or the non-necessary but suggestive conclusions of arguments *ex convenientia.*[154] Fundamentally, however, the intelligibility of revelation must be seen in the light of faith. The search for necessary reasons differs from the philosophical arguments in support of the faith, as demonstrations *propter quid* differ from demonstrations *quia.* A demonstration *propter quid* regards the intelligibility of an effect by means of a thorough knowledge of its cause. In theology, the search for necessary reasons requires a grasp of God so profound that one can see the necessity or at least the suitability of his action or revelation. To the person who

---

[153] The clearest claims in this regard are in *Hex.* 2.22–26 (5, 340). In earlier texts, Bonaventure speaks of non-rational creatures as pointing to the Trinity, but only by way of the Trinitarian appropriations. Thus, in them one sees the power, wisdom, and goodness of their cause, but cannot deduce that their cause is a Trinity of persons (see I *Sent.*, d. 3, p. 1, a. un., q. 2, ad 4 [5, 72]; *Scien. Chr.*, q. 4 [5, 17–27]; *Itin.* 1.11 [5, 298]). In the *Hexaëmeron*, he speaks of the representation of the Trinitarian relations in every substance.

[154] Tavard points out a difference between arguments *ex convenientia* and arguments *ex congruentia.* The former point to a fittingness that is based in the metaphysical order, while the fittingness of the latter is in the moral order. For example, it is *conveniens* that the Son should become incarnate, since he is the one through whom all things were made, and so is fittingly the one through whom all things are restored. The time of the incarnation is judged to be *congruentissimum* because our moral disposition to be receptive to the revelation of Christ was greater after the passing of many ages than it would have been immediately after the Fall. See Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence*, 201–3.

does not have faith, such arguments may seem reasonable (i.e., because of the continuity of natural and graced intelligibility), but they will not be truly probative (i.e., because that person will not share the same grasp of the principle).

This style of argument is most thoroughly on display in the *Breviloquium*, where every argument proposed is derived from the first principle (of creation, or of redemption).[155] The arguments of the *Breviloquium* will be regarded as more or less demonstrative depending on one's grasp of the first principle.[156] One can also see how this sort of argument hearkens back to the requirement that the theologian be influenced by grace. Different degrees in transformation in grace will produce different abilities to identify necessary reasons.

Ex pietate

Like the argument from necessary reasons, the argument *ex pietate* is dependent in part on the graced insight of the theologian. Unlike the previous argument, however, the argument *ex pietate* is not a deduction from a necessary cause, but a judgment in favor of a conclusion on the basis of a principle that does not form part of the demonstration.

Theological reasoning will frequently uncover several possible explanations of a truth of faith. How is one to judge between them? Bonaventure sometimes notes a difference between an argument that appeals to philosophical reason and one that appeals more to faith; though the former is not illegitimate, the latter is to be preferred.[157] Yet even within the latter one can make distinctions. Some arguments are useful in a practical sense in fostering the devotion, love, virtue, etc. of the theologian, and may be preferred for that reason. Such arguments should, however, be distinguished from the argument *ex pietate*.[158] An argument *ex pietate* is one that is in keeping with "the piety of faith,"[159] which has two aspects. One is the piety that one displays to authority—namely, scripture and

---

155 See Monti, "Introduction," xxii–xxxviii.

156 The overall argument of the *Breviloquium* could be called an argument by *reductio* as well, since Bonaventure is certainly trying to retrace the particulars of the faith to that on which they depend. However, the style is certainly that of the search for necessary reasons: "Because the First Principle (…)"

157 See, e.g., II *Sent.*, d. 30, a. 1, q. 1 (2, 714–717).

158 See esp. Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence*, 203f.; cf. Bougerol, *Introduction*, 53.

159 III *Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 2 (2, 21–28).

the fathers of the church. Thus, an opinion that is more clearly in keeping with the testimony of scripture and the fathers is to be preferred. The other aspect is the piety we have toward God, which ascribes to him the greatest glory. In this light, that opinion that is more in keeping with the glory of God is to be preferred.

These distinctions may be elaborated in the question on the primary reason of the incarnation. The tradition had offered two reasons for the incarnation: redemption from sin (Anselm) and the perfection of creation (Hugh of St Victor).[160] The question Bonaventure poses is: Which one is the primary reason? Philosophical reason alone does not make a decisive judgment between these opinions. In view of the practical, religious end of devotion, one could argue that it is better to think that redemption is the primary reason, for this will move the heart to gratitude for God's gift. In view of piety toward scripture and the fathers, that opinion would be preferred which is more clearly attested in those sources.[161] In view of piety toward God, or the need to ascribe to him the greater glory, it is again preferable to think that redemption is the primary reason. As George Tavard notes, "Christ is not in creation like a perfecting element, since, as a Person, he towers high above all creaturely perfection."[162] Therefore, the opinion that the primary reason for the incarnation is the perfection of creation can be misleading with respect to the relationship between God and creation, and is therefore not congruent with the "piety of faith."

The argument *ex pietate*, in its latter aspect of ascribing greater glory to God, involves an adjudication between varying opinions in light of some other feature of God or his revelation. It accords with the affective end of theology—not by warming the affections of the theologian, but by reflecting the intimate knowledge of God that is had in the theologian's real relationship with him.[163]

---

[160] For an assimilation of Bonaventure's view on this question to that of Duns Scotus, see Ilia Delio, "Revisiting the Franciscan Doctrine of Christ," *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 3–23.

[161] On these grounds, Bonaventure comes to the same conclusion as Aquinas: scripture far more clearly associates the incarnation with redemption, and thus, in proper piety to scripture, one should hold that the primary reason for the incarnation was redemption.

[162] Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence*, 204.

[163] See above, on theology as an affective science.

Conclusion

Bonaventure's theology is both scientific and sapiential, analytical and symbolic. Emphasis on any one of these perspectives is fruitfully balanced by emphasis on another. It is undoubtedly this richness and variety that has earned him a place of honor among the greatest theologians in the history of Christianity—for his writings are not well enough known,[164] nor his particular doctrines so generally held, to justify the accolades that have been poured upon him. Some of the attention that has been paid to him in the past half-century is certainly owed to the general expansion of medieval studies. Some contemporary interest in him may be due to the sense some authors have of his harmony with contemporary perspectives and concerns. And certainly, as with any great thinker, one expects that some who come across him for the first time, without preconceptions, will be taken with the power of his work.

Without denying the legitimacy of this multitude of approaches, and its existence in fact, the description of his theological methodology offered in this chapter might be described as an attempt to identify the perennial questions and commitments of that theology in a way that allows Bonaventure to be placed in dialogue with his scholastic contemporaries, particularly Aquinas. As Ewert Cousins says, "as a philosopher-theologian, [Bonaventure] ranks with Thomas Aquinas as one of the greatest synthetic minds in a century that was outstanding for its theological synthesis."[165] And yet the Seraphic Doctor had far less lasting impact as a philosopher-theologian than did the Angelic Doctor. Contemporary scholars have done well to free Bonaventure scholarship from the prejudicial view that comes from reading him in comparison with Aquinas. But part of Bonaventure's value is best visible in that light—for example, the difference in their views of the subject of theology, with Bonaventure incorporating into his doctrine a sense of God's self-expressivity; their justifications of theology as a subalternated science, with Bonaventure's reliance upon the

---

[164] With the exception of those works in what might be called spiritual theology (viz., the *Itinerarium* and *De triplici via*). For information on the "school" of Bonaventureanism, see Colman J. Majchrzak, *A Brief History of Bonaventurianism* (Washington, D.C.: 1957); Franz Ehrle, S.J., "Die neue Schule des hl. Bonaventura," *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 25 (1883): 15–29. Despite the proliferation of Bonaventure studies in recent decades, Cullen is able to describe Bonaventurianism—a synthetic view of his philosophy and theology on its own terms—as "something rarely seen" (Cullen, *Bonaventure*, xiv).

[165] Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 2.

transformation of reason in grace; and the difference between arguments *ex convenientia* and arguments from necessary reasons. If one cannot judge Bonaventure as a Thomist, one can nevertheless see that he and Aquinas were engaged in very similar projects, that they recognized the same questions, and that their theologies thus bear close correspondence. On the basis of Bonaventure's texts themselves, one can and should view his theological method as that of a *magister*. Implicit in this view is the question of a perennial theological method. And it is in asking Thomistic questions of Bonaventure, and Bonaventuran questions of Thomas, that the greatest light will be shed on the possibilities of such a method.

BONAVENTURE'S PHILOSOPHICAL METHOD

Christopher M. Cullen

Anyone attempting to investigate Bonaventure's philosophical method faces an immediate difficulty, namely, that Bonaventure was a Christian theologian: he taught theology at the University of Paris and most of his writings are theological in genre and purpose. Even his work that treats the widest range of philosophical issues, *The Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, is itself a theological text. These indisputable facts might seem to preclude the possibility of reading Bonaventure as anything other than a theologian. Nevertheless, even though Bonaventure was a theologian by training and profession, we can find considerable philosophy in the midst of his theological writings. In this regard, it is accurate to say that he is, at least, a philosophical theologian, that is, someone who draws extensively from philosophical sources and engages in philosophical argumentation.

Bonaventure is explicit that, while philosophy relies on reason, theology relies on "authorities," above all, the highest authority, the word of God. Yet, while engaged in theology, Bonaventure is consistently careful to distinguish arguments from reason and arguments from faith. We can see this careful distinction between arguments from philosophy and those from theology at work even on as central a question as whether God exists. Of course, sacred scripture affirms the existence of God, but Bonaventure argues that we can know that God exists apart from the authority of the Bible.[1] Even if someone has never encountered the Christian Bible, it is possible to know that God exists.

Furthermore, Bonaventure does not merely present the philosophical opinions of others in his work; he himself philosophizes, that is, he consistently analyzes and assesses arguments based on reason concerning the perennial questions of the philosophers.

---

[1] For Bonaventure's discussion of arguments for the existence of God, see his *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*, q. 1, a. 1, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. (Works of Saint Bonaventure) 3 (Saint Bonaventure: 1979). See Louis Mackey's detailed discussion of Bonaventure's arguments for the existence of God: *Faith Order Understanding: Natural Theology in the Augustinian Tradition* (Toronto: 2011), 75–119.

Even while engaging in theology, Bonaventure strictly observes what we can call philosophy's "integrity": it is a distinct discipline with its own method of argumentation and its own principles. It is precisely this careful methodological distinction that allows someone who would go looking for philosophy in the writings of medieval theologians to separate out their philosophy without significantly distorting it. Indeed, Bonaventure belongs to a theological tradition that is distinguished precisely by at least two elements: its strict observance of the distinction between philosophy and theology, and its insistence that philosophy is essential to the theological task. This theological tradition that scrupulously observes the distinction between philosophy and theology, while also making extensive use of the former, is scholasticism.

In Bonaventure's view, any consideration of the proper way to practice philosophy also has to consider its relation to the possibility of a science of God's special revelation, i.e., theology (or "sacred scripture," to use Bonaventure's frequent term for this concept). For if there is evidence of a divine revelation, then reason's search for wisdom is necessarily propaedeutic to God's own revelation, which would constitute naturally the apex of this quest. While Bonaventure maintains the view that philosophy is a discipline with its own integrity, he thinks that it is ultimately heteronomous, in that it must recognize its own intrinsic limits and that it is only one step in the larger journey of the mind to wisdom. Bonaventure distinguishes in order to unite: he explicitly maps out the whole range of human knowledge, and while carefully distinguishing philosophy from theology, tries to argue that all the arts and sciences can lead the mind back to God. Philosophy emerges as one step in the mind's larger journey to wisdom itself and to God.

This heteronomous view of philosophy poses a crucial question for the modern reader: whether it is possible to subordinate philosophy to a putatively higher discipline without violating its integrity. Admittedly, the modern answer to the question of the possibility of philosophy being subordinated without loss of integrity has been unambiguously no. Modernity has insisted that the integrity of philosophy requires what we could call unconditional (or absolute) autonomy, i.e., independence, or even separation, from any ruling discipline or body of knowledge. This autonomy is unconditional, in that it affirms that even if there were a divine revelation, this body of knowledge ought not to serve as an extrinsic norm for philosophy.

In other words, the religious beliefs of the philosopher ought not to be normative for the philosophical endeavor. Modern philosophers have

generally regarded any subordination of philosophy to a governing discipline as the way to undermine its ability to analyze and assess theses and arguments. In short, in the view of many modern philosophers, even a conditional autonomy for reason is dubious, and a heteronomous philosophy, subject to the rule and completion of religious faith, is an out-and-out contradiction in terms, which jeopardizes the philosophical endeavor.

Modern philosophy's claims for the absolute rule of reason in the human mind bring to the fore the fact that a harmonious relation of faith and reason is not easily achieved, for the fundamental reason that both religious belief and reason, and their corresponding disciplines, i.e., theology and philosophy, are "totalizing," that is, they tend to make absolute their claim to rule the human mind. Philosophy and theology consider many of the same questions and objects of investigation. Both faith and reason involve a tendency to what we might call "imperialism," when it comes to which should sit enthroned in the hall of human consciousness.

Hence, we can face the challenges of understanding Bonaventure's philosophical method only if we are willing to consider a pre-modern conception of philosophy as subordinated to divine revelation. Bonaventure belongs to an intellectual tradition that was centered around the project of reconciling authority and reason.[2]

What is more, philosophy is a sapiential quest, that is, a discipline that is not only more broadly conceived than a purely academic, professional pursuit, but also one open to the possibility of transcendence, i.e., the possibility of divine revelation. In this regard, we need to consider in detail what Bonaventure means by wisdom, and by philosophy, as the discipline engaged in the search for wisdom: philosophy involves far more than the consideration of reality in the light of reason alone and engages the human being more profoundly than only as an academic profession demanding the operation of one's reason. Philosophy emerges as a way of life and as one step in a sapiential journey of the mind to God.[3]

---

[2] Philipp W. Rosemann, *Understanding Scholastic Thought with Foucault* (London: 1999), 47. Rosemann has an interesting discussion of Martin Grabmann's thesis that medieval thought centered around the reconciliation of authority and reason. See Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols. (Freiburg: Herder, 1909–1911). See also Timothy Noone, "Scholasticism," in *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jorge J.E. Gracia and Timothy Noone (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy) (Malden, MA: 2003), 55–64.

[3] For the remote background to this view, see Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*, trans. Michael Chase (New York: 1995).

Bonaventure's philosophical method cannot then be presented without many distinctions for a very good reason: his understanding of wisdom is profoundly complex. One finds the complexity of Bonaventure's method in the text from one of the defining moments of his life: the *Journey of the Mind to God*, which derived from his own journey up a heavily-forested, Tuscan hill in the Apennines, known as La Verna. La Verna was where Francis of Assisi (c. 1181–1226) had received a famous angelic vision; Bonaventure makes this journey (*itinerarium*) precisely because he counts himself among the lovers of wisdom (*amatores sapientiae*). In this journey of the mind, Bonaventure ascends to God. One might say that the three basic steps of this journey exemplify Bonaventure's larger method of moving from the world to the soul in order to ascend to God. This journey in pursuit of wisdom takes the lover to the central purposes of human life and to nothing less than the First Principle (*Primum Principium*) of the universe.

In order to investigate Bonaventure's philosophical method, it is valuable to proceed step by step: first, to consider the historical and intellectual context in which Bonaventure worked and so to consider the new literary and pedagogic forms that the scholastics developed in order to appropriate the largest collection of Greek philosophical works that the West had seen since antiquity; second, to examine Bonaventure's account of the end of philosophy—wisdom; third, to examine the complex relationship of the various disciplines, and especially between philosophy and theology, and faith and reason—a relationship established by the manifold meanings found in wisdom; fourthly, to examine the epistemological foundations that make possible the operation of reason as a means to knowing reality; fifth, to survey the domain of knowledge attained by philosophy's highest branches, namely, metaphysics and natural theology; sixth, to examine the limits of reason and of philosophy; and finally, to consider philosophy's heteronomous relation to a transcendent order.

Historical Context and the Concordance of Discordant Authorities

In order to understand Bonaventure's philosophical method, it is important to see him in the context of the great intellectual enterprise of the late twelfth and early thirteenth-centuries, namely, the Latin West's reception and appropriation of the Greek philosophical heritage from antiquity. In this period, scholars gradually found themselves faced with

a broad range of sources and opinions; chief among these voices was that of "the Philosopher" from ancient Greece—Aristotle.[4] But Aristotle did not "come alone," but as part of long tradition of later thinkers and commentators—a tradition that includes a wide range of Arabic, Jewish, and various Neo-Platonic sources (often thought to be Aristotle's).[5] The arrival of this ancient corpus and its commentators coincided with the Latin West's discovery of nature in the twelfth century. This "discovery" of nature involves a renewed focus on questions of cosmology and the natural world that coincided with a renaissance of learning.[6] The conjunction of this discovery of nature and the arrival of Aristotle set in motion revolutionary changes that would play themselves out throughout the thirteenth century and beyond.

By 19 March 1255, the Arts faculty at the University of Paris established Aristotle's corpus as the core curriculum of the university; bachelors in the Arts faculty were to have studied all his known works.[7] Aristotle came to be seen as the apotheosis of reason:

> Medieval Latin scholars eagerly embraced Aristotle's methodology and his approach to the physical world, while adding important ideas about the cosmos from Christian faith and theology. The conscious and systematic application of logic and reason to the natural world was the first major phase in the process that would eventually embrace modern science.[8]

---

[4] Edward Grant, *God and Reason in the Middle Ages* (New York: 2008). See also my detailed discussion of the historical context of Bonaventure's work, Christopher M. Cullen, *Bonaventure*, (Great Medieval Thinkers) (New York: 2006), 3–35.

[5] See Charles Burnett, "Arabic into Latin: The Reception of Arabic Philosophy into Western Europe," in *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, ed. Peter Adamson and Richard C. Taylor (Cambridge, UK: 2005), 370–404. One can find the influence of Arabic philosophy on Bonaventure in a number of ways. For example, Avicebron's interpretation of Aristotle's theory of the hylomorphic composition of substances as applying to all finite beings, that is, even to spiritual substances, such as angels and human souls, is present in Bonaventure's thought. See O. Lottin, "La composition hylémorphique des substances spirituelles. Le début de la controversie," *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* 33 (1932): 21–41; Pierre Duhem, *Le système du monde*, vol. 6 (Paris: 1954), 100–105; James Weisheipl, O.P., "Albertus Magnus and Universal Hylomorphism: Avicebron: A Note on Thirteenth-Century Augustinianism," *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1979): 239–60.

[6] Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P., *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, ed. Jerome Taylor (Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching) 37 (Toronto: 1997); original: *La théologie au douzième siècle* (Paris: 1957). The literature on this twelfth-century renaissance is vast.

[7] Charles H. Lohr, "The Medieval Interpretation of Aristotle," in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzman et al. (New York: 1982), 87.

[8] Grant, 149–50.

Medieval scholastics were to find in reason not only a handmaiden for theology but "the essential tool for explaining the operation of the entire physical cosmos."[9]

Aristotle's arrival posed significant challenges for a world shaped by a long and multi-layered tradition of Neo-Platonism that draws on many eras and many sources. These Christian thinkers were faced with a number of intellectual crises as a result of trying to reconcile Aristotle's (or pseudo-Aristotelian) doctrine with a fundamentally Neo-Platonist Christianity. One sees this point repeatedly in reading Bonaventure. Bonaventure reads Aristotle through the eyes of Augustine. Given this, Bonaventure's philosophy needs to be seen against "the story of a complex tradition founded in Neo-Platonism."[10] Bonaventure does not fit into an older historical narrative that views the development of scholasticism as a sudden Aristotelian turn that is constituted by the repudiation of Plato and his most influential Latin disciple and church father, namely, Augustine. For Bonaventure, all three are wise, and even though he explicitly calls Augustine the wisest, he clearly sees part of his task as incorporating the Aristotelian insights into the intellectual heritage of Augustine and other authorities, most of whom are deeply formed by Neo-Platonism.[11] In this regard, Bonaventure bears a certain resemblance to ancient Neo-Platonists who operated on the assumption that a harmonizing reading of Aristotle and Plato was possible.[12]

Not surprisingly, then, one of the more complex problems encountered in studying Bonaventure is understanding his reception of Aristotle. One finds Aristotle, presented as "the Philosopher," throughout Bonaventure's works, especially in his early *Commentary on the Sentences*. Even in the writings of a scholastic theologian such as Bonaventure, Aristotle is the most frequently cited philosophical source.[13] There is no explicit critical word about Aristotle in the *Commentary*, and certainly no systematic rejection or even underlying animus. On the contrary, what one finds,

---

[9] Grant, 15.

[10] Marenbon, 3.

[11] Bonaventure, *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus* (8, 335).

[12] See Lloyd Gerson, *Aristotle and Other Platonists* (Ithaca, N.Y.: 2005), esp. 1–23.

[13] Bougerol counts 930 quotations from Aristotle in the works of Bonaventure (Jacques Guy Bougerol, O.F.M., *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck [Patterson, N.J.: 1964], 27). He also points out that Bonaventure quotes from every one of Aristotle's works, except the *Politics*. See also Leo Elders, "Les citations d'Aristote dans le 'Commentaire sur les Sentences' de Saint Bonaventure," in *San Bonaventura Maestro de Vita Francescana e di Sapienza Cristiana* (Rome: 1976), 831–42.

even when Bonaventure is rejecting an Aristotelian thesis, is an irenic reading.

Yet, the task for the reader of Bonaventure is to reconcile this early irenic reading of Aristotle with a later, more critical reading as found in his *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*. By the time of the composition of this latter work in the 1270s,[14] Bonaventure is reacting against a conception of Aristotelian science that had developed on the Arts faculty and that sought, in some ways, to divorce philosophy from faith and from the ecclesial culture of the day. Charles Lohr expresses well the spirit of this new and radical Aristotelianism, which developed in the Arts faculty in the 1260s:

> But in him [Aristotle] they [the masters of arts] found a new paradigm, a new model not only for interpretation, not only for science, but also for the vocation of the university man. In Aristotle, the Philosopher, they found the researcher, the questioner—or to use Aristotle's own words, the hunter, the discoverer, the seeker—one who subjected the teachings of his predecessors to a relentless critique, who was subservient to no authority and free of all dogmatism.[15]

A comprehensive account of Bonaventure's reading of Aristotle is beyond the scope of this survey of Bonaventure's philosophical method, but as we shall see, Bonaventure will insist upon the limits of reason and philosophy and on the importance of the subordination of philosophy to a higher science.

This influx of "ideas" transformed the medieval world and would prompt new methods of investigation. The medieval schools, constituted by masters and students, developed a new method for appropriating the philosophical heritage of antiquity.

In order to understand this new method, it is important to consider briefly older methods of learning and scholarship. For generations of medieval students, the common method of learning was centered around *lectio divina*, or the prayerful reading of sacred scripture. This method of inquiry was designed for understanding and appreciating the word of God found in sacred scripture. "Since scripture is a book, one must know how to read it, and learn how to read it just as one learns how to read any other book."[16] The medieval schools inherited this method from the early church fathers and the monastic tradition of learning. *Lectio divina*

---

[14] Bougerol (177) dates the *Collationes in hexaemeron* to 9 April–28 May 1273 in Paris.

[15] Lohr, 91; see Aristotle, *Prior Analytics* I, 30 (46a11).

[16] Jean Leclercq, O.S.B., *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Catharine Misrahi (New York: 1982), 72.

aided the investigation and exegesis of the scriptural text in such a way that the four "senses" (or layers of meaning) presumed to be found in the depths of the text might be brought to light.[17]

Lectio divina was especially well suited for its purposes. In the monastery culture of the Middle Ages, the purpose of the *lectio* was not speculation about matters of curiosity, but to draw closer to God. "The monastic *lectio* is oriented toward the *meditatio* and the *oratio*."[18] The prayerful reading of the biblical text is to prompt the reader to meditation and prayer, so as to draw the believer closer to God. These practices in the life of an educated monk led to the development of a distinctive type of theology—"monastic theology," as it has been called. The differences between monastic theology and scholastic theology are considerable, but nowhere is the difference more striking than in the methods employed to achieve the end of theology. Monastic theology is rooted in *lectio divina* and so remains ordered to the exegesis of the sacred page (*sacra pagina*). Scholastic theology, while continuing to recognize the Bible as "the sovereign textbook" and while still rooted in the careful and meditative reading of sacred scripture, will significantly expand the medieval library, and so develop new methods for taking account of a wider range of "authorities" unknown in the earlier monastic circles. "The fundamental teaching method of the medieval schools, which they handed on to the universities that grew out of them, was the exposition of authoritative texts."[19]

What is particularly distinctive of Bonaventure, even as a representative of the new scholastic theology, is that he remains rooted in the older, monastic tradition with its conviction that the end of theology is to lead the theologian to greater love of God, in a word, to holiness.[20] Bonaventure would find little, if anything, to disagree with in the following passage from St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), which expresses succinctly the monastic conception of theology:

> Likewise knowledge of God is one thing and fear of God, another; what confers wisdom is not knowledge but fear that touches the heart. He who is puffed up because of his learning, by what right can he be called a wise

---

[17] Henri de Lubac, S.J., *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. Mark Ebanc (Grand Rapids: 1998); original: *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture* (Paris: 1959).

[18] Leclercq, 72.

[19] R.W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA: 1997), 102.

[20] See Gregory LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom: The Nature of Theology according to St. Bonaventure* (Bibliotheca Seraphico-Capuccina) 76 (Rome: 2005).

> man? One would have to be entirely lacking in wisdom to call those wise who, having acquired knowledge of God, have not honored him as God, and have not rendered him thanks.[21]

We can compare this passage from St Bernard, for example, with a similar one, among many, from St Bonaventure:

> If you wish to know how these things can come about [i.e., union with "him who is above all essence and all knowledge" (*qui est super omnem essentiam et scientiam*)], ask grace, not learning; desire, not the understanding; groaning of prayer, not diligence in reading; the Bridegroom, not the teacher; God, not man.[22]

Imbedded within the tradition of monastic theology is also a notion of science that developed in the medieval schools, what has been called "clerical science": "For the Middle Ages it was not the individual who taught, but the Church, through the clergy."[23] The project for this clerical, or ecclesial, conception of science was to harmonize discordant authorities; this aim was based on the conviction that truth is ultimately one, and so the wise cannot contradict each other, in so far as they have come to the truth.

> Within this conception of the scientific enterprise a standard method of interpretation was developed based on the presumed concordance of the fundamental authorities, and schools evolved whose function was the training of masters who should transmit traditional learning to God's people.[24]

When the wise do not seem to agree, a method is needed that allows the reader to juxtapose and consider specific questions that arise on various issues. Since the wise seem to be in conflict on many issues, and even, on occasion, to be in contradiction with each other, this apparent conflict and contradiction must be paradoxical, i.e., (ultimately) resolvable (at least in most cases). The resolution of these conflicts requires, therefore, a dialectical method that puts the wise in conversation with each other.

The early scholastics developed dialectical methods of juxtaposing the opinions of authorities (i.e., the wise, especially the church fathers), regardless of their own time or culture, in order to find the truth of the

---

[21] St Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sup. Cant.* 23.14, quoted in Leclercq, 214.

[22] *Si autem quaeras, quomodo haec fiant, interroga gratiam, non doctrinam; desiderium, non intellectum; gemitum orationis, non studium lectionis; sponsum, non magistrum; Deum, non hominem* (*Itinerarium mentis in Deum* 7, 6, trans. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. [Works of Saint Bonaventure] 2 [Saint Bonaventure: 1956]).

[23] Lohr, 80.

[24] Lohr, 80.

matter. The literary medium for the task of bringing harmony to discordant authorities, while also engaging in a rational investigation of a faith that seeks understanding, is the scholastic *quaestio*. In addition to these speculative purposes, the *quaestio* served as a pedagogical method of introducing students to the dialogue about an issue. In this regard, it helped them to acquire the habit of thinking theologically and philosophically. Indeed, the *quaestio* is perhaps the central instrument in scholasticism. It is the literary form that both distinguishes scholasticism and, in turn, shapes this tradition. "Scholasticism" is arguably, first and foremost, a distinctive method of inquiry. One must be careful, however, not to exaggerate the distinctiveness of the *quaestio*. It still bears a striking resemblance to the dialogues of antiquity, as found, for example, in the works of Plato or Cicero; like the dialogue, the *quaestio* also involves entering into a sort of "meeting of minds" or "conversation of the wise," which involves an investigation of the question, i.e., the discovery of the truth of the matter insofar as this can be done.

The ecclesial conception of science encountered a radically new conception of science with the arrival of Aristotle and other sources in the thirteenth century. Bonaventure will remain rooted in the ecclesial conception of science while also embracing much of the Aristotelian conception. Of course, Bonaventure learned logic from Aristotle. And it is precisely the application of logic to the doctrines of the faith and to sacred scripture that is another distinctive trait of scholasticism.[25] We can find Bonaventure carefully demarcating a meaning of science as a speculative operation rooted in created reason and rational principles.[26] But it is important to note both how far Bonaventure has entered into the scholastic project of forming theology into an Aristotelian science, and yet how significantly he qualifies certain precise points in this science. He will insist, for example, that theology is not exclusively speculative—that it also retains a practical end.

We find scholasticism's new methods operative in Bonaventure's works, most clearly in his early work, *The Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*. In this work Bonaventure is commenting on what had become the principal textbook, after the Bible, in the theology faculty. The story of this textbook's entry into the center of the theology curriculum is a

[25] See Alain de Libera, "The Oxford and Paris Traditions in Logic," in Kretzman et al., 174–187.

[26] *III Sent.*, d. 24, a. 1. q. 1 ad 2 (3, 509); also d. 35, a. 1, q. 5 concl. (3, 776).

fascinating one, but beyond the scope of this essay; for our purposes, it is valuable to recall that it is an ordered anthology of the opinions (*sententiae*) of church fathers, especially Augustine.[27] Although these opinions are not designed to contradict each other, they often do, and Peter the Lombard attempts to reconcile them.[28] Peter thus bequeaths to the schools a literary practice that will form the basis for scholasticism and its attempt to reconcile a vastly larger range of sources, especially drawn from philosophical texts.

Bonaventure also wrote different types of works—sermons, biblical commentaries, spiritual treatises, a "biography," a theological handbook (the *Breviloquium*)—but in none of these theological works do we find Bonaventure the scholastic as clearly and as widely exemplified as in his *Commentary on the Sentences*. This is his largest and most comprehensive work.

As had become customary in composing a commentary on the Lombard, Bonaventure preserves the basic divisions of the *Sentences*. He proceeds through sections concerning God (bk. 1), creation (bk. 2), the incarnation (bk. 3), and the sacraments (bk. 4). The exposition of each book is further divided by distinctions, concerning general topics. Each distinction is further subdivided into five parts: 1) the *divisio textus*, which involves a broad outline of the text to be commented upon; 2) the *tractatio quaestionum*, which is the order of exposition; 3) the articles (one or more) into which specific issues are grouped; 4) the questions (one or more) of each article; 5) the *dubia* which address difficult points in the *Sentences*.[29]

Each particular question within this larger architectonic is itself a highly ordered unit. It will include 1) the question (*quaestio*); 2) the *fundamenta* or arguments that generally support and clarify the position taken by the author; 3) the "*sed contra*" or "*ad oppositum*," which generally includes arguments contrary to that taken by the author, but which often provides an inventory of possible solutions; 4) "the *respondeo*" which is the author's own conclusion or determination (*determinatio*) of the question; 5) and the section *ad objecta*, consisting of responses to the contrary arguments

---

[27] For background and a detailed treatment of Peter Lombard, see Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History) 41 (New York: 1994). See also Philip Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Great Medieval Thinkers) (New York: 2004). Alexander of Hales (c. 1185–1245) is the first Parisian master to use the Lombard's *Sentences* as his textbook for theology.

[28] John Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy: An Historical and Philosophical Introduction* (New York: 2007), 161.

[29] Bougerol, 59.

mentioned in the question.[30] Bonaventure follows this structure throughout the *Commentary*.

We can find this method at work in his discussion of whether truth is a perfection of the divine being. He begins by listing four arguments in the affirmative from authorities (by which he is referring here to fathers of the church); he then lists three arguments from "reasons." In the "*sed contra*" he lists four arguments against the question, three from reason and one from authority, i.e., Augustine. In his response, he argues primarily on the basis of reason that truth is an attribute of God. He cites in passing the Lombard, Augustine, and St Jerome to support his determination of the question.

Or we can look to Bonaventure's discussion of divine simplicity, to take another example. He argues almost entirely from reason that God is supremely simple. Authorities are quoted to support Bonaventure's determination of the question, but the basic answer is based on reason. God alone is being; for the being of every creature is necessarily limited and mixed, and therefore not simple, by the mere fact that it is not being and must have received the act of being by which it is.[31]

Another literary and pedagogic form that scholasticism developed is the *disputatio*. The *disputatio* too is distinctive of the scholastic method.[32] The purpose of the *disputatio*, in its live setting in a university hall, is to test the ability of the bachelor of the *Sentences* to argue. The written form of the *disputatio* is thus the end result of a much larger and more complicated event.[33] There were two main forms of disputations: *disputatio ordinaria* and *disputatio quodlibetalis*. We do not have any *disputatio* in the latter form from Bonaventure. Bonaventure's writings, however, include two sets of disputed questions that are of particular philosophical importance, the *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity* and the *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, dating from between 1253 and 1257.[34] In its general purpose and structure, the disputed question has considerable similarity to the *quaestio*, but it tends to present a wider

---

[30] See Bougerol's step-by-step analysis of the divisions of Bonaventure's *quaestio* in his chapter on "Method" (60–73), where he examines *Sent*., III, d. 24, a. 2, q. 3.

[31] *I Sent*., I, d. 8, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (1, 149). By "mixed," Bonaventure seems to mean that the created thing is participated or dependent for receiving its being.

[32] Philipp W. Rosemann, *Understanding Scholastic Thought*, 87.

[33] Bougerol, 73.

[34] Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. (Works of Saint Bonaventure) 4 (Saint Bonaventure: 1992).

range of arguments, and so is especially valuable for understanding the philosophical views of the author.[35]

The Journey of the Mind to Wisdom

Any consideration of philosophical method has to consider the end of philosophy, namely, wisdom, for the very straightforward reason that a "method" is a way of proceeding in order to obtain an end. And so, any investigation of Bonaventure's philosophical method has to examine the ways he thinks philosophy is able to lead the mind to wisdom. One illuminating way to do this is to examine Bonaventure's treatment of the end or object of the philosophic quest, namely, wisdom (*sapientia*), and the breadth of Bonaventure's view of it. Indeed, analyzing the concept of wisdom in Bonaventure's thought provides us with a key that unlocks many doors in his thought.

In an important passage in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Bonaventure explicates four meanings of the term wisdom (*sapientia*) that are operative throughout his work. He thinks it can be used commonly (*communiter*), less commonly (*minus communiter*), properly (*proprie*), and more properly (*magis proprie*).

When used commonly, wisdom refers to the general cognition of things (*cognitionem rerum generalem*). It is in this sense, he says, that Augustine defines wisdom as "the cognition of divine and human things." The Philosopher, i.e., Aristotle, defines it by saying that "the wise is one who knows all things, in accordance with what is fitting."[36] In this sense wisdom appears synonymous with philosophy, used in a broad sense to refer to knowledge or science in general.

In a less common sense, wisdom bespeaks a sublime cognition, i.e., a cognition of eternal things. Bonaventure quotes St Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, where the apostle says that "some were given through the spirit the word of wisdom, others, the word of knowledge." Augustine's interpretation of this is that "wisdom is cognition of eternal things; science the cognition of creatures." Bonaventure harmonizes Augustine's distinction by equating the cognition of eternal things with Aristotle's notion of wisdom as the cognition of the highest causes.[37] "Wisdom" in

[35] Bougerol, 73.
[36] *III Sent.*, d. 35, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (3, 774).
[37] *III Sent.*, d. 35, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (3, 774).

this sense is synonymous with metaphysics, as Aristotle's science of the highest causes may be called.

Taken properly, Bonaventure continues, wisdom refers to the knowledge of God according to piety (*secundum pietatem*). Wisdom in this sense is the cognition that one attains in the worship of God through faith, hope, and charity. Here wisdom is synonymous with Augustine's notion of true religion (*vera religione*), which a Christian believer has through the grace of the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity.[38]

More properly still, wisdom refers to the direct, experiential knowledge of God. In this way, wisdom refers to the special gift of the Holy Spirit, and consists in a tasting of the divine sweetness. And since this is an interior, spiritual tasting, it involves an act of both the intellect and the affections, or what St Bernard of Clairvaux speaks of as charity made perfect in wisdom. This is the wisdom of the holy and contemplative person.[39] "Wisdom" is an analogous term that can refer to various mental activities grounded in habits of the mind. For the purpose of investigating philosophical method, what is more noteworthy is Bonaventure's clear demarcation of philosophy as a means to wisdom.

Wisdom is ultimately a term for God himself, insofar as he is the ultimate source of all truth and rationality and the principle of the created order of the universe. Indeed, Bonaventure argues that "wisdom" signifies more primarily and more nobly God than some quality in us.[40]

According to Bonaventure, then, the pursuit of wisdom ultimately involves an assimilation to God, in two ways: in so far as the holy person can obtain some glimpse of the beatific vision, i.e., indirectly through a special grace, and insofar as the beatified in heaven obtain a face to face experience of God in eternal life. The former is the wisdom of the holy mystic; the latter the wisdom of the blessed. On this point Bonaventure stands broadly in the Platonic tradition that regards the end of philosophy as assimilation to God, but he is distinguished from a reading of Plato that would deny that this assimilation is dependent on divine agency and gift.

Concerning the first meaning of "wisdom," as referring to the cognition of things divine and human, and as used commonly of philosophy, Bonaventure explicitly takes up two objections that are important for this

---

[38] *III Sent.*, d. 35, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (3, 774).
[39] *III Sent.*, d. 35, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (3, 774).
[40] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, a. 1, q. 4 resp. (1, 489).

consideration of his method. The first objection is that divine and human things, i.e., the created and uncreated, are too diverse to be part of one wisdom.

To this first objection Bonaventure begins by explaining that wisdom can be taken in two senses (much as we speak of "general" and "special" justice). So wisdom, taken properly, is the cognition of the highest causes (as in metaphysics), while taken commonly, includes the cognition of all things. In this way, wisdom can include diverse sciences, both those concerned with creatures and those concerned with the creator, for in the knowledge of creatures, one finds manifested the wisdom of God.[41] And so, the Philosopher's inquiry into the reasons of things naturally leads to the highest causes.[42]

The second objection that Bonaventure takes up is that created things are not worth knowing and thus are in no way to be considered part of wisdom, for the simple reason that human things, in comparison to divine things, are as nothing (*quasi nihil sunt*). Finite things are simply not worth knowing in comparison to infinite things. Indeed, "just as a point adds nothing to a line, so the cognition of human things human adds nothing beyond the cognition of divine things. Therefore, it seems that the cognition of human things should not concern the integrity of wisdom itself."[43]

To this second objection, i.e., that human, finite things are not worth knowing in comparison to divine, infinite things, Bonaventure responds that, although it must be granted that we do not know the infinite with regard to its "immensity," nevertheless we are on the way (*in via*), and we strive to behold Truth himself, and therefore it is necessary to know this truth insofar as one can through its effects.[44] Wisdom as synonymous with philosophy, as the rational inquiry into reality, yields something less than salvation but not inconsequential. It yields a habit of the mind that renders the human being happy in the limited sense of fulfilling the human desire for knowing things and their relations.

Bonaventure thus bases the ultimate warrant for the philosophic quest in the fact that the wisdom of God is "manifold" or "multiform" (*multiformis sapientia Dei*) in creation.[45] Bonaventure says at one point,

---

[41] *III Sent.*, d. 35, dub. 1 resp. (3, 787).
[42] See Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, bk. 1, ch. 1.
[43] *III Sent.*, d. 35, dub. 1 resp. (3, 787).
[44] *III Sent.*, d. 35, dub. 1 resp. (3, 787).
[45] Bonaventure, *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology* (*De reductione artium ad theologiam*), in *The Works of Saint Bonaventure*, ed. Zachary Hayes (Saint Bonaventure: 1996), 26.

"Behold, how the wisdom of God lies hidden in natural philosophy."[46] In fact, Bonaventure thinks that the divine wisdom is "hidden in all knowledge and in all nature."[47] "God himself is hidden within."[48] The task of the human being is to search out and find this wisdom, as in a vast game of "hide and seek."

Yet, this multiform wisdom is most explicit in God's own special revelation, as found in "sacred scripture." Hence, all knowledge can lead us back (*reductio*) to the highest wisdom, God himself. All types of knowledge can help us to know and love God, which is the purpose of all learning. Indeed, without this ordering to God, "all knowledge is vain."[49]

Nevertheless, there is a clear and distinct limit to what the human mind can find in the natural order. This examination of the different senses of wisdom is valuable for prompting us to understand that wisdom, as a gift to the soul disposing the human being to the reception of this beatifying vision, is also beyond human achievement. Or rather, the human being's active role in the reception of this gift lies in accepting it.

Wisdom, in the stricter senses, i.e., as the reception of a divine gift, requires an act of the will and a submission of the intellect that yields the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. And wisdom as the deepening of this grace of faith involves the investigation and reflection on the word of God that is usually known as theology, and wisdom as grace, achieved through divine gift, can be deepened and strengthened through the mind's reflecting on God's revelation. In Bonaventure's view, the primary method for attaining this type of wisdom is the *lectio*—the painstaking and careful consideration of the word of God from a number of different perspectives carried out for the purpose of penetrating the fourfold layers of meaning found in the divine word of sacred scripture.

The Reduction of the Arts to Theology

We also find warrant for distinguishing philosophy from theology in Bonaventure's own treatise on the range of human knowing, *On the Reduc-*

---

[46] *Et ecce qualiter in philosophia naturali latet sapientia Dei* (Bonaventure, *Red. art.* [5, 325]).

[47] *Red. art.*, 26 (5, 325): *Et sic patet quomodo multiformis sapientia Dei, quae lucide traditur in sacra scripturae occultatur in omni cognitione et in omni natura.*

[48] interius lateat ipse Deus (*Red. art.*, 26).

[49] *Red. art.*, 26 (5, 325): *Omnis illuminatio desursum descendens et sine qua omnis cognitio vana est.*

tion of the Arts to Theology (*De reductione artium ad theologiam*), in which he defends philosophy as a discipline distinct from theology and yet as an integral part of a comprehensive plan of studies and a larger search for wisdom.[50] When we turn to this text where Bonaventure discusses philosophy as a discipline or a mode of inquiry, we find that he has quite a lot to say about philosophy.

This treatise is of particular note for consideration of Bonaventure's method, for it is greatly concerned with the organization and unity of knowledge. It attempts to order all the arts. (He uses "art" in this text in a general sense to refer to every rational, creative activity concerned with making.)[51] But before examining the substance of this text, it is valuable also to consider its form as an example of *reductio*. "*Reductio*" refers to a resolution or retracing, a "leading back," of something to its origin or principle.[52] Bonaventure thinks that *reductio* is operative in the whole order of reality. "For the Seraphic Doctor it is assuredly more than a mere technique, for his whole synthesis tends to define how the entire creation that issued from God returns to him in the manner of an intelligible circle."[53]

The Reduction of the Arts to Theology belongs in line with a trend begun, at least most directly for Bonaventure, in the *Didascalicon* of Hugh of St Victor (d. 1141).[54] Like Hugh, Bonaventure wants to find the unity of knowledge in theology and the proper order of studying the different fields of knowledge, all for the sake of attaining wisdom, i.e., the knowledge that achieves the deepest purposes of human life. Also like Hugh, Bonaventure will carefully demarcate the role of philosophy in this larger education, or formation, of the human being. The *Reduction* is thus Bonaventure's contribution to the Victorine search for the "*humanisme intégral*."[55] In this regard, Bonaventure's work also reflects Augustine's ancient quest for the

---

[50] The dating of *Red. art.* is not certain. Bougerol (163) thinks it likely to be a late work, perhaps following Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*.

[51] See *I Sent*., d. 2, q. 4 ad 4 (1, 58) where Bonaventure contrasts art as a mode of production involving reason with nature as a mode of production not involving conscious reason. Nature produces a likeness (*similis*); art produces its effect according to an exemplar.

[52] Bougerol, 75; also 164.

[53] Bougerol, 75. Cf. Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 5, 1 n. 6 (5, 253).

[54] Hugh of St Victor, *The Didascalicon*, trans. J. Taylor (New York: 1961). See also Cullen, 89. For a more detailed treatment of Hugh's educational reform, see Franklin Harkins, *Reading and the Work of Restoration: History and Scripture in the Theology of Hugh of St Victor* (Toronto: 2009).

[55] Winthrop Wetherbee, "Philosophy, Cosmology, and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance," in *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, ed. by Peter Dronke (New York: 1988), 23. See also, Leclercq, 140–43.

proper Christian *paideia*, a quest mapped out in his influential *De doctrina christiana*, especially bk. 2 with its rules for studying subjects other than the Bible.[56] Augustine presents an expansive curriculum for the sake of reading and contemplating scripture. Bonaventure builds on this Augustinian educational charter. Like Augustine, Bonaventure recommends the reading of pagan authors.

Bonaventure painstakingly divides the realm of human knowledge in this work. He presents knowledge as a type of created light (*lumen*) that the mind can perceive. This light is fourfold (*quadruplex lumen*): there is the light of the mechanical arts (*lumen artis mechanicae*), the light of sense knowledge (*lumen cognitionis senstivae*), the light of philosophical knowledge (*lumen cognitionis philosophicae*), and the light of sacred scripture (*lumen sacrae scripturae*). It is important to note that philosophy, insofar as it is the third light, is distinct from theology and clearly demarcated from sense cognition and the mechanical arts.[57] Bonaventure clearly distinguishes philosophy from the "saving truth" (*veritatem salutarem*) or "the light of sacred cripture" (*lumen sacrae scripturae*).[58]

He subdivides philosophy into three branches: rational philosophy (logic), natural philosophy (physics), and moral philosophy. Rational philosophy investigates the truth of words (*veritas sermonum*); natural philosophy, the truth of beings (*veritas rerum*); and moral philosophy, the truth of deeds (*veritas morum*).[59] Bonaventure further explains that natural philosophy, in so far as it illumines or pursues knowledge of the causes of being (*ad cognoscendas causas essendi*), is called "physics"; rational philosophy, insofar as it seeks the principles of understanding (*rationes intelligendi*), is called logic; and moral philosophy, the order of living (*ordinem vivendi*). He further subdivides rational philosophy into grammar, rhetoric, and logic; he subdivides natural philosophy into physics (in the proper sense), mathematics, and metaphysics. "Physics" investigates the generation and corruption of things according to their natural powers and seminal principles (*rationes seminales*). Mathematics considers abstract forms in terms of their intelligible causes, and "metaphysics is concerned with the knowledge of all beings according to their ideal causes

---

[56] Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*.

[57] See Elspeth Whitney, *Paradise Restored: The Mechanical Arts from Antiquity through the Thirteenth Century* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society) 8/1 (Philadelphia: 1990).

[58] *Red. art.* (5, 321–322).

[59] Andreas Speer, *Triplex Veritas: Wahrheitsverständnis und philosophische Denkform Bonaventuras* (Franziskanische Forschungen) 32 (Werl: 1987).

(*rationes ideales*), tracing them back to the one first Principle (*primum principium*) from which they proceeded, that is, to God, in as far as God is the Beginning, the End, and the Exemplar."[60] Moral philosophy is divided into personal, domestic, and political, depending on which of three orders of life is being investigated.

This division of philosophy reflects the thirteenth century's adoption of Aristotle's tripartite division of philosophy into theoretical (or natural) philosophy, practical philosophy, and logic.[61]

When the third of the fourfold light, i.e., philosophy, is so divided into its three main branches, one finds a sixfold illumination or refraction, for the three lights of the branches of philosophy are only half of the spectrum of light. Nevertheless, philosophy emerges as the center of the curriculum, the mediating discipline, so to speak, between the lower lights of sense knowledge and the mechanical arts and the higher science of theology. Above all these created lights, there is an eternal and uncreated light, which is God himself. But all these lights can lead us back to comprehend that the First Principle is the cause of being (*causa essendi*), the principle of understanding (*ratio intelligendi*), and the order of living (*ordo vivendi*).[62] Bonaventure's intellectual method is thus intrinsically ordered to a synthesis. For, as he asserts, these six illuminations are to culminate in the seventh day, when all knowledge (*omnis scientia*) will be destroyed; on that Sabbath—the day of everlasting light that knows no evening—there will be only the illumination of glory (*illuminatio gloriae*).[63]

As we have seen, in this early text, Bonaventure carefully demarcates a discipline that he calls philosophy, and then further subdivides it into its traditional branches. With equal care, he then subordinates philosophy to what he regards as a higher wisdom and a higher light (*lumen superius*), namely, theology.[64]

---

[60] *Metaphysica circa cognitionem omnium entium, quae reducit ad unum primum principium, a quo exierunt secundum rationes ideales sive ad Deum in quantum principium, finis, et exemplar* (*Red. Art.* 43 [5, 321]).

[61] Rosemann, 80–81.

[62] *Red. art.*, 4 (5, 320). Cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 1.8.4, cited in Bougerol, 231.

[63] *Red. art.*, 45.

[64] *I Sent.*, prooem. q. 2 ad 4 (1, 11): *Quod patet sic: quia non quaelibet determinatio trahens in partem facit subalternationem scientiae, sed determinatio quodam modo distrahens. Nam scientia de linea recta non dicitur subalternari geometriae, sed scientia de linea visuali, quoniam haec determinatio quodam modo trahit ad alia principia. Quoniam igitur sacra scriptura est de credibili ut credibili, hic est de credibili ut facto intelligibili, et haec determinatio distrahit—"nam quod credimus debemus auctoritati, et quod intelligimus, rationi"—hinc est, quod sicut alius modus certitudinis est in scientia superiori et inferiori, ita alius modus*

Wisdom as the habit of the mind born of philosophy is achieved through great effort and the rational investigation of the truth of thought (*veritas vocum*, logic), the truth of beings (*veritas rerum*, physics), and the truth of doing (*veritas morum*, ethics).

Bonaventure's theory of wisdom's complexity, combined with his formal distinction between philosophy and theology, allows us to understand that philosophy can attain wisdom in its own right. This point is crucial and subject to dispute. Theology perfects and brings to completion the search for wisdom already begun.

Bonaventure's division of wisdom closely parallels his division of knowledge (*scientia*) into those founded on reason, i.e., philosophy and ethics, and those founded on revelation and grace, i.e., the science of sacred scripture and moral theology. Philosophy (*scientia humanae philosophiae*) is founded on the principles of reason (*principia rationis*) and is acquired from the examination of creatures; ethics (*scientia prudentiae/virtutis*) is founded on the principles of natural law and, while present in the intellect, inclines the affect to action. The science of sacred scripture (*scientia sacrae scripturae*) is founded on the principle of faith and inclines it to the affect. Moral theology (*scientiae donum*) is founded on the principle of faith from the gift of grace and involves the intellect's inclination to the doing of the good.[65]

Faith and Reason

There are a number of difficulties with the approach discussed here, but one of the foremost is that this order sets up a complex relationship between philosophy and theology, and concomitantly, faith and reason.

There is no question that whatever philosophy Bonaventure pursued, he did so as a Christian believer. That is, his own philosophical thinking was carried out in the mind of someone who believed the creedal commitments of the Christian faith, or to speak in more scholastic terminology, his philosophical thinking was conducted by someone who possessed

---

certitudinis est in sacra scriptura et alius in hoc libro, et ideo alius modus procedendi. Et sicut scientia subalternata, ubi deficit, redit ad certitudinem scientiae subalternantis, quae maior est; sic etiam, cum Magistro deficit certitudo rationis, recurrit ad auctoritatis certitudinem sacrae scripturae, quae excedit omnem certitudinem rationis. For a discussion of Bonaventure's conception of theology, see G.H. Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence: The Nature of Theology according to Saint Bonaventure* (St. Bonaventure: 1954).

[65] *III Sent.*, d. 35, q. 2 resp. (3, 776).

the theological virtue of faith, this supernatural virtue being understood as a habit (*habitus*) of the soul.

To the question whether it is possible to separate out Bonaventure's philosophy without significantly distorting it, one of the most important medievalists of the twentieth century, Étienne Gilson, will answer yes, but only on the condition that one recognizes that what Bonaventure is doing when he philosophizes must be understood to be a "Christian philosophy," that is, "every philosophy which, although keeping the two orders formally distinct, nevertheless considers the Christian revelation as an indispensable auxiliary to reason."[66] And in the case of Bonaventure, his understanding of Christian philosophy entailed that reason, unaided by the light of faith, cannot philosophize without the admixture of error. In other words, faith is necessary for philosophy to accomplish its own task. The claim is not simply that philosophy cannot attain the full truth, for example, about God (namely, that he is triune); but rather, that philosophy cannot attain certain knowledge without error. Gilson writes:

> It is, then, not surprising if St Bonaventure held every philosopher inescapably doomed to error who is not aided in his philosophy by the light of faith. Philosophy can no more attain its proper development than theology, unless grace intervenes to guide and strengthen it.[67]

In order for philosophy to perform its task, it must be carefully subordinated to theology, and in the individual believer, this means that reason must be infused with the virtue of faith. Of course, Christian theology is faith seeking understanding, as the famous St Anselm of Canterbury had insisted in the century before Bonaventure; that is to say, as Bonaventure himself does say, theology's task is to make that which is believed (the *credibile*) intelligible.[68] In this conception of Christian theology, reason is tasked with penetrating the truths of the faith in so far as it is able. Christian philosophy, however, is also faith seeking understanding; but it is the understanding of reality insofar as reason is suffused with faith—a faith that has at least a twofold role in the mind of the believer: one,

---

[66] Étienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, trans. A.H.C. Downes (New York: 1940), 37.

[67] Étienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*, trans. Illtyd Trethowan (Paterson, NJ: 1965), 101.

[68] *I Sent.*, prooem. q. 2 ad 4 (1, 11): *Quoniam igitur sacra scriptura est de credibili ut credibili, hic est de credibili ut facto intelligibili, et haec determinatio distrahit—"nam quod credimus debemus auctoritati, et quod intelligimus, rationi"—hinc est, quod sicut alius modus certitudinis est in scientia superiori et inferiori, ita alius modus.*

to demarcate positive errors, i.e., theses that contradict the claims of faith; and two, to prompt consideration of theses that might never have been otherwise considered had it not been for revelation.

Gilson thinks that the excision of philosophy from a medieval theologian is possible as long as one recognizes its theological context and preserves its theological order, such that, what one has is not philosophy in the modern sense of the term, as an absolutely autonomous discipline, free of any faith commitments, but rather, a Christian philosophy, rooted in the faith of the believer, which guides and directs reason while yet respecting its ability to distinguish different types of argument.

We find this Christian philosophy approach clearly at work in Bonaventure's sermon, "Christ as the One Teacher" (*Christus Unus omnium Magister*). In this sermon, he presents the view that there are three modes of knowing: through the faith of pious assent, through the approval of right reason, and through the clarity of pure contemplation. Bonaventure ties the first to the habit (*habitus*) of faith, a supernatural grace; the second to the habit of the gift of understanding, and the third to the habit of blessedness, which is purity of heart.[69] These three modes—faith, "rational knowledge," and "contemplative knowledge"—provide the human knower with a tripartite perspective on reality. These three modes also provide a tripartite order on the path to wisdom: "We begin with the firmness of faith and proceed through the serenity of reason so as to arrive at the sweetness of contemplation."[70] No one is obliged to move beyond the first mode of knowing, but Bonaventure clearly regards faith as the necessary condition for the later two modes. Faith is foundational for philosophy and for contemplation. He quotes the Vulgate translation of Isaiah, "Unless you believe, you will not understand."[71]

In this interpretation, Christian philosophy is thus a generic term that applies to different species. For this conception leaves open the question of how philosophy is precisely to be subordinated to theology and faith. Two possibilities, for example, present themselves in the mid-thirteenth century. Gilson carefully distinguishes this view that he attributes to Bonaventure from that of Aquinas. Aquinas subordinates philosophy to

---

[69] Bonaventure, "Christ the One Teacher of All" (*Sermo Christus unus omnium magister*) (5, 567), in *What Manner of Man?: Sermons on Christ by Saint Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. (Chicago: 1989), par. 1, 22.

[70] *Ordo enim est, ut inchoetur a stabilitate fidei et procedatur per serenitatem rationis, ut perveniatur ad suavitatem contemplationis* (*Chr. mag.*, par. 15, 34 [5, 571]).

[71] *Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis* (*Chr. mag.*, par. 15, 35 [5, 571]).

theology in such a way that it is "sufficient to itself within its own sphere."[72] It is thus at least theoretically possible to develop a philosophy free from error without the aid of faith (even if the historical likelihood of this happening is fairly remote).[73] "For St Bonaventure, on the other hand, reason is only competent in its own field if it keeps its gaze fixed upon truths beyond its competence."[74] Indeed, Gilson will go so far as to extend this claim to all human endeavors: "As this works out in practice, there is *no* field that belongs to reason alone: and with that, St. Bonaventure turns his back upon the modern separation of philosophy from revelation."[75] In sum, Bonaventure's defense of philosophy's integrity does make an excision possible as long as we recognize that Bonaventure subordinates philosophy in what we might call a heteronmous discipline.

Yet it is precisely on the very possibility of a Christian philosophy that Ferdinand Van Steenberghen would object. The Gilson-Van Steenberghen debate took place over the course of many years.[76] This debate, to no small extent, hinges on the philosophical question of whether reasoning must be autonomous from the commitments of faith in order to be philosophy. In other words, Gilson and Van Steenberghen ultimately disagreed about the very nature of philosophy. Philosophy is necessarily autonomous in Van Steenberghen's view. And so, Bonaventure is, at most, a theologian making use of philosophy, whether this philosophy be someone else's or the fruit of his own philosophizing.

Gilson seems, however, to misstate Bonaventure's conception of the heteronomy of philosophy. His treatment of these issues in his work *The Philosophy of St Bonaventure* fails to draw sufficient attention to the fact that Bonaventure grounds philosophy in a certitude attained by reason (distinct from the certitude of faith), and that philosophy's heteronomy is located in the fact that it can come to recognize its own limits, both with regard to its own finite capacities and with regard to the inexhaustible immensity of its object, i.e., being itself. The great problem for philosophy without grace is not where Gilson tends to locate it, namely, in the insufficiency of reason to attain any truth, but in the insufficiency of reason to attain the fullness of truth. The philosophy of the pagans may be riddled

---

[72] Gilson, *Philosophy of St Bonaventure*, 103.
[73] Gilson, *Philosophy of St Bonaventure*, 103.
[74] Gilson, *Philosophy of St Bonaventure*, 103.
[75] Gilson, *Philosophy of St Bonaventure*, 103.
[76] For a survey of the larger debate about the possibility of Christian philosophy, see Gregory B. Sadler, "Introduction," in *Reason Fulfilled by Revelation: The 1930s Christian Philosophy Debates in France* (Washington: 2011), 1–96.

with errors, but this is a contingent fact rooted in any number of possible factors (not the least of which may be their manner of living), but there is nothing about the nature of reason itself, even after original sin, that necessitates its falling into error. It is, of course, highly unlikely for "faithless" philosophy to be free of error, given various factors, especially man's sinfulness, but nevertheless, the point remains: there is nothing about reason itself that actually necessitates error. Christian philosophy simply attains more than the philosophy of the pagans (and, of course, Christian theology attains even more still).

This is not to deny that Bonaventure clearly thinks that philosophy's discovery of its heteronomous relation to a higher science saves it from its own collapse and endows it with an openness to the transcendent order. It is rather to say that, in Bonaventure's view, the conditional autonomy of philosophy is primarily rooted in an intellectual humility that recognizes, on the one hand, the finitude of reason, and, on the other, the infinite plenitude of being, which is ultimately ineffable. It is secondarily rooted in the historically contingent fact of man's fallen nature, that is to say, in man's proclivity to sin, and thus the failure to pursue wisdom in holiness.

Philosophy is formally distinct from theology. It is the distinction between types of arguments that allows modern readers to separate out philosophical from theological reasoning and thus to excise Bonaventure's philosophy from theology without distorting either. Each is a distinct *habitus* of the human soul. Philosophy is not materially distinct, for the fundamental reason that it covers some of the same objects of theology, namely, God, man, and the universe. That is to say, even when philosophy and theology treat the same subject matter, they remain distinct in their forms of reasoning about any designated subject.

We see this point very clearly in Bonaventure's discussion of whether faith applies to those things of which knowledge is had. First, Bonaventure explains that there is no faith in heaven: "If we speak of a knowledge attained directly, in the way in which God is known in heaven, this cannot subsist with faith in the sense that the same object may be at the same time both known and believed, for the reason that such knowledge absolutely excludes any obscurity." But in his response, Bonaventure argues that we can have knowledge and faith of the same object:

> The reason why such knowledge may bear upon the very same object as faith, so that the one perception does not exclude the other, is that knowledge by progressive reasoning, while producing some certitude and evidence

> in divine matters, leaves such certitude and evidence short of full clarity as long as we are in this life. Although it is possible to prove by means of necessary reasons that God exists, and that God is one, yet to see the very being of the Godhead, or the very oneness of God, or the manner in which this oneness does not exclude the plurality of Persons, is quite impossible unless [the mind] is cleansed by the righteousness of faith. Hence, illumination and certitude by knowledge is not so great as to render superfluous the illumination of faith; on the contrary, such an illumination is a necessary addition.[77]

Bonaventure thinks that something may be both an object of science and of belief. He says that just as nothing impedes some item from being both hidden and evident (*latens* and *patens*), nothing impedes the same item from being known by different ways of knowing, from below or from above, so also with regard to the known and the believed (*scitum* and *creditum*). Indeed, in the response to the objection that "it is impossible, then, for faith and knowledge to subsist together in regard to one and same object" because this knowledge would destroy charity (i.e., the love of God for its own sake), he argues that "to give one's assent to a demonstrated truth by reason of the demonstration, if the conclusion is true and necessary, can be called neither a sin nor a mistake, and is in no way in contradiction to faith."[78]

He qualifies this with regard to the cause of the assent. In cases, there may be more than one cause: the final cause and a secondary motivating principle. "If it refers to the final cause, then one and the same thing cannot be the object of faith because of itself and something else."[79] But if it refers to the secondary motivating principle(s) (*ratio movens*), then something can be both known and believed. There is, of course, no

---

[77] *Ratio autem quare talis scientia simul potest esse de eodem cum ipsa fide, ita quod una cognitio alteram non expellat, est, quia scientia manuductione rationationis, licet aliquam certitudinem faciat et evidentiam circa divina, illa tamen certitudo et evidentia non est omnino clara, quamdiu sumus in via. Quamvis enim aliquis possit rationibus necessariis probare, Deum esse, et Deum esse unum, tamen cernere ipsum divinum esse et ipsam Dei unitatem, et qualiter illa unitas non excludat personarum pluralitem, non potest, nisi "per justitiam fidei emundetur." Unde illuminatio et certitudo talis scientiae non est tanta, quod habita illa, superfluat illuminatio fidei, immo valde est cum illa pernecessaria* (Bonaventure, *III Sent*., d. 24, a. 2, q. 3 resp. [3], quoted in Bougerol, 66).

[78] *Sed assentire alicui vero probato propter rationem probantem, dum illatio sit vera et necessaria, nec hoc dicit peccatum nec dicit errorem, et ideo non sic habet repugnantiam ad fidem* (Bonaventure, *III Sent*., d. 24, a. 2, q. 3 ad 1 [III], quoted in Bougerol, 67–68).

[79] "Hence it can be said that, when someone knows and believes, the disposition of faith plays in him the principal part. Therefore it is by the assent of such faith that he adheres to [this point of] truth because of itself, and this in such a way that the proposition *because of* refers [not to the final principle but] to the foremost motive principle" (*III Sent*., d. 24, a. 2, q. 3 ad 1 [3], quoted Bougerol, 69).

problem if some truth is an object of faith but not of knowledge. The difficulty occurs when some truth is an object of both faith and knowledge. In order for this to be possible, Bonaventure insists that the object of the act of faith must be embraced because of the final cause, even if reason finds secondary reasons for assent to the same object. Whether some proposition may be an object of both faith and knowledge (in the strict sense of the word) is crucial to saving Bonaventure from the accusation of a sort of rationalism, since there are so many truths of the faith also accessible to reason. Of course, he is not a rationalist in the sense of someone who believes that there is no knowledge beyond that of reason; but he might be accused of narrowing the domain of faith by means of expanding the domain of reason. But these two modes of knowing are not involved in a zero-sum game. They have overlapping domains within the human mind, made possible by different but concurrent causes of assent.

Epistemological Foundations: The Quest for Certitude and Divine Illumination

Any investigation of Bonaventure's philosophical method must examine his account of the epistemological foundation of knowledge and certitude. While it is not possible to provide here a detailed account of his epistemology, a brief consideration of the main points is no doubt essential for understanding his philosophical method.

The corpus of Bonaventure's writings presents us with two different theories of human cognition. One theory is his version of Aristotle's abstraction theory and is found in his *Commentary on the Sentences*. The other theory is his version of Augustine's illumination theory. There are various texts where he presents his illumination theory, but above all, it is found in his *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*. A synthesizing reading of these two theories is possible and best fits the texts.

Before examining these two theories, it is valuable to recall that Bonaventure holds that the human being is a rational animal, a hylomorphic composition of form and matter, soul and body, endowed with various powers. The soul is the perfection and moving principle (*motor*) of the human being—the perfection with regard to substance, and the mover with respect to the powers.[80] In the former role, the soul is the act

[80] *II Sent.*, d. 18, a. 2, q. 1 fm (2, 445).

of the body. In discussing this definition, he explicitly quotes Aristotle's *De anima*, employs the term "entelechy" from the Greek text, and understands this to refer to an activating principle that transforms and shapes passive matter.[81] The soul thus gives act and completion to the body. If the relation between soul and body is that of act and potency, then it follows that the rational soul is, as he defines it, "the perfection of a body intended by nature to be informed by rational life." Bonaventure speaks of the rational soul as "an existing, living, intelligent form having freedom of choice," or, as he puts it even more simply, the soul is a form, endowed with being, life, intelligence, and freedom.[82] "Soul" is thus, most properly, a particular type of form, namely, a living one; and the rational soul is more specifically, intelligent and free.

Bonaventure thinks that the soul has a vegetative, sensitive, and intellective power. The intellective power, or the human mind, possess three powers, consubstantial with its being: memory, intellect, will.[83] This tripartite structure of the human soul, then, is capable of acquiring certain virtues that perfect it. Science (*scientia*), for example, perfects the human intellect.[84]

We find Bonaventure's cognition rooted in the senses. Bonaventure affirms Aristotle's view that the mind is like a blank slate before it begins to know, and that it acquires its knowledge through experience.[85] Bonaventure understands the sensitive power of the human being to be like the power of a light (*lumen cognitionis sensitivae*) that is able to illuminate, or apprehend, the sensible things in the world. Each of the senses has its proper object that it seeks, delights in when found, and so, seeks again.[86] The forms, which are ontological principles that make things to be what they are, are also capable of serving as epistemological principles when rendered actually intelligible by the active intellect.[87]

In his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Bonaventure presents his version of Aristotle's abstraction theory. He posits that the agent intellect is a light that shines on the sensible likeness presented to it and abstracts out an intelligible likeness which it then impresses on the possible intellect.[88]

---

[81] *II Sent.*, d. 18, a. 2, q. 1 fm (2, 445).
[82] *Brev.*, 2, 9 (5, 226).
[83] *I Sent.*, I, d. 3, p. 2, a. 1, q. 3, resp. (1, 84–88).
[84] *I Sent.*, prooem., q. 3, resp.
[85] *II Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 4 (2, 569).
[86] *Red. art.*, 10 (5, 22).
[87] *Red. art.*, 3 (5, 320).
[88] *II Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 4 (2, 569). See also Cullen, 57–58.

The agent intellect is thus the efficient cause that renders the potentially intelligible actually so. It is then in the possible intellect that the concept, or *verbum mentis*, is born. The details and complexities of this Bonaventurean abstraction are beyond our purposes here, but it is important to note that this theory provides a naturalizing account of human cognition, one that is rooted in an empirical foundation.

Bonaventure adopts Aristotle's great insight that the task of science is to attain stable and abiding judgments about a world that is in flux. The great problem for anyone claiming to have right judgments about the world is that the world is constantly changing. Bonaventure himself cites Heraclitus as the one who has taught us that reality is like a river so quickly flowing by that the one cannot really grasp it. The things of the world both are and are not, at least in a certain sense. This fact poses seemingly insurmountable difficulties for any claim to attain fixed and abiding judgments about the sensible singular.

What adds to the difficulty is that Bonaventure draws his standard for knowledge from Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, which he cites: "For we know 'when we judge why a thing is, and we know that it is impossible for it to be otherwise.' "[89]

Scientific knowledge is thus closely tied to certitude, in that such knowledge is understood to involve knowing the cause of a thing, and so recognizing that the argument relating effect and cause is necessary and immutable, thus necessitating an unwavering assent from the intellect. As Bonaventure will then explain, "Scientific knowledge necessarily requires immutable truth on the part of the thing known and infallible certitude on the part of the knower."[90] These dual epistemic conditions—a necessary, immutable object and an infallible knower—establish a burden impossible for the unaided human mind to attain, in Bonaventure's view. The human mind is not a sufficient cause of certain truth. This is not to say that the senses or the mind lack the power to carry out their natural functions. Bonaventure regards the mind's operations as "operationally sufficient." But no thing capable of motion and change is able to provide an immutable object; and no mutable knower can claim infallibility. The latter claim seems indubitable. It is the former claim that seems particularly

---

[89] *Tunc enim scimus, "cum causam arbitramur cognoscere, propter quam res est, et scimus, quoniam impossibile est aliter se habere"* (Bonaventure, *Chr. mag.*, 6, 26 [5, 568]). Cf. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 71b9.

[90] *Ad cognitionem enim scientialem necessario requiritur veritas immutabilis ex parte scibilis, et certitudo infallibilis ex parte scientis* (*Chr. mag.*, 6, 26 [5, 568]).

odd for anyone accepting the primary thesis of Aristotle's physics, namely, that the existence of substantial forms is explanatory of substances. In this theory, the human mind's apprehension need merely attain an eidetic insight into the substantial form of a thing in order to possess a stable and abiding object requisite for the term of a judgment. Bonaventure's refusal to accept the sufficiency of the simple apprehension's operation—its grasping of the essence of a thing, expressed in an interior concept—is rooted in his conviction that the "immutability standard" for the object requires an immutability not subject to time. Of course, such "atemporal immutability" is beyond any finite, temporal being's capacity for attaining. Only a divine illumination would be sufficient for rendering the object apprehended by the intellect and expressed in the term of a proposition to be absolutely and truly immutable (and thus not merely conditionally immutable, as in Aristotle's theory). That there are such immutable and infallibly certain truths, Bonaventure thinks, is evident from logic and from mathematics, for example.

Hence, from early in his career, Bonaventure held the position that the human mind is not sufficient for attaining certitude. Bonaventure's keen sense of the absolute limits of human reason does not constitute some form of skepticism, but is simple realism about the human epistemic condition. The mind needs a cause adequate to the effect, which knowledge is. And since the true propositions of scientific knowledge are immutable and so command absolute assent, only an eternal and immutable cause could bestow such immutability to the object known and infallibility to the agent knowing. It follows that only a divine light could illumine the human mind to attain such certitude. Sensation alone does not attain the certitude necessary for scientific judgments. "The light of the created intellect of itself is not sufficient for the certain comprehension of anything without the light of the eternal Word."[91]

To close the epistemic gap, Bonaventure turns to Augustine's theory of illumination, as found in *De libero arbitrio*: "Do not deny in any way that there is unchangeable truth, containing those things which are immutably true, which I cannot say is yours or mine or any man's, but which presents itself common to all who perceive the eternal truths."[92] In other words, when the human being attains immutable truth through intellec-

---

[91] *Lux ergo intellectus creati sibi non sufficit ad certam comprehensionem rei cuiuscumque absque luce Verbi aeterni* (*Chr. mag.*, 10, 29 [5, 569–70]).

[92] *Nullo modo negaveris, esse incommutabilem veritatem, haec omnia, quae incommutabiliter vera sunt, continentem, quam non possum dicere tuam vel meam vel cuiusquam*

tual actions, God cooperates as the object and moving reason—not the "only, bare, or total means" of attaining knowledge, but as object and moving cause, nonetheless.[93] So Bonaventure thinks that we have some access to the ontological truth of things, that is, some glimpse or "contuition" of the exemplar.[94]

In Bonaventure's view, the ultimate, foundational truth relation is not between the knowing mind and the object known, but between the divine mind and a being itself. The idea of a being, as present in the divine mind and thus known by God, cannot change, for whatever is in God must be God, and God cannot change. This relation between the divine mind and the idea or exemplar of a thing and the thing itself is often referred to as "ontological truth" and so distinguished from the "logical truth" of propositions.[95] Bonaventure is quite explicit about this: "It must be said that truth can be understood in two ways. In one way truth is identical with the entity of a being. To this, Augustine writes in his *Soliloquies* that 'truth is whatever exists.' In another sense, truth is the expressive light in intellectual knowledge."[96] In other words, the locus for the ultimate foundation for truth is the divine mind and its expressions, which serve as exemplars for created being. Bonaventure's epistemological foundation is found in his theory of divine exemplarism.

With this firm foundation in the certitude of reason, Bonaventure can take up many of the principal issues of the ancient discipline of metaphysics, and in so doing, attain the heights of philosophy.

Bonaventure thinks that the metaphysician attains the notion of being. Indeed, being is that which is first known.[97] The difficulty, however, is that Bonaventure says that this being that is first known is the perfect, divine being. He thinks that a type of reflection on being will ultimately lead us to that perfect Being, who is God. He calls this method of reflection that prompts us to an indistinct and indirect cognition of divine being

---

hominis, sed omnibus incommutabilia vera cernentibus praesto esse ac se praebere communiter (Augustine, *De libero arbitrio*, 2.12 n. 23, quoted in *Chr. mag.*, 8, 27 (5, 569)].

[93] *Chr. mag.*, 17, 36. This point demarcates Bonaventure from ontologism, a version of illumination theory that holds that the human mind attains a direct vision of God.

[94] Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, q. 4 con.: "For certain knowledge, the eternal reason is necessarily involved as the regulative and motivating principle, but certainly not as the sole principle nor in its full clarity. But along with created reason, it is contuited by us in part as is fitting in this life" (trans., 134).

[95] *Red. art.*, 41 n. 4.

[96] *Scien. Chr.*, q. 2 ad 9 (trans., 93).

[97] Camille Bérubé, "De la théologie de l'image à la philosophie de l'objet de l'intelligence chez Saint Bonaventure," in *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974*, vol. 3 (Grottaferrata: 1974), 161–200.

resolutio. He argues that being can exist in only two ways: either as subsistent, self-modeled and self-intended, or as contingent, modeled on another and tending to another."[98] The metaphysician, insofar as he attains this notion of being as subsistent, self-modeled, and self-intended, comes close to the theological notion of the Trinity of Father, Son and Spirit but does not attain it. Instead, the metaphysician attains a notion of the divine being. Yet this notion of pure being is more accurately understood as the intentional presence of God in human reason than as an innate idea (in a somewhat Cartesian sense), a type of theory that Bonaventure explicitly rejects.[99]

Furthermore, since metaphysics investigates subsistent being, which Bonaventure thinks must be mind, then the first principle must know, and in doing so, expresses himself through a likeness to himself. This eternal Expression is an interior, eternal Word. And insofar as subsistent being wills to create, this eternal word is also the Exemplar for all contingent being. "This center (*medium*) is truth."[100] Bonaventure writes: "Such is the metaphysical center that leads us back (*reducens*) and this is the sum total of our metaphysics: concerned with emanation, exemplarity, and consummation, that is, illumination through spiritual radiations and return to the Supreme Being. And in this you will be a true metaphysician."[101] Here Bonaventure is drawing on the Anselmian notion of ontological truth.

> For the metaphysician rises to the notion of this being by seeing it in the light of the original principle of all things, and in this he meets physical science that studies the origin of all things. He also rises to the notion of this being in the light of the final end, and in this he meets moral philosophy, or

---

[98] *Esse enim non est nisi dupliciter: vel esse, quod est ex se et secundum se et propter se, vel esse quod est ex alio et secundum aliud et propter aliud* (Bonaventure, *Hex.*, 1, n. 12, 7 [5, 331]).

[99] Bonaventure is aware of a theory of innate ideas and explicitly rejects it: *Quod voluerunt aliqui intelligi sic, quod intellectus noster dicatur habere apud se cognitionem universalium innatam, alioquin non posset per virtutem suam, abstrahendo etiam a sensibus et phantasmatibus, facere intellectum possibilem actu intelligentem; omne enim quod educit alterum de potentia in actum, est ens in actu.* Sed iste modus dicendi verbis Philosophi non consonat, qui dicit, "animam esse creatam sicut tabulam rasam," "nec habere cognitionem habituum sibi innatam, sed acquirere mediante sensu et experientia" (*II Sent.* d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 4 resp. [2, 569]). See the discussion of this point by Timothy Noone, "Divine Illumination," in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, vol. 1, ed. Robert Pasnau (New York: 2010), 377.

[100] *Unde illud medium veritas est* (Bonaventure, *Hex.*, 1, n. 13, p. 8 [5, 331]).

[101] *Hoc est medium metaphysicum reducens et haec est tota nostra metaphysica: de emanatione, de exemplaritate, de consummatione, scilicet illuminari per radius spirituales et reduci ad summum. Et sic eris verus metaphysicus* (Bonaventure, *Hex.*, 1, n. 17, 10 [5, 332]).

> ethics, which leads all things back to the one Supreme Good as to the final end by considering either practical or speculative happiness. But when he considers this being in the light of that principle which is the exemplar of all things, he meets no other science, but is a true metaphysician.[102]

Bonaventure thinks that metaphysics, grounded in the certitude of reason derived from divine illumination's activity on the intellect, leads to a rich and complex natural theology. Certain points about God can be known by reason (*per scientiam acquisitam*); others cannot, such as the plurality of Persons, or the humility of our nature that God assumed, i.e., the incarnation.[103] These doctrines are wholly above reason and above science (*supra rationem et supra scientiam*).[104]

Furthermore, there is a limit inherent in human thought, grounded in the fact that God is greater than anything in the world, but also beyond human conception. Bonaventure is certainly aware of the Fourth Lateran Council's authoritative declaration at the beginning of the century (1215) that God is beyond any genus of thought or predication: "For between the Creator and the creature there must be noted no similarity so great that a greater dissimilarity cannot be seen between them."[105] Bonaventure affirms both the Anselmian view that God is that than which nothing greater can be thought and the implication of this view, that God is beyond any genus.[106] Bonaventure thus belongs without question in the long tradition of "apophatic theology."

Nevertheless, it is possible that one can establish by reason that God exists, that he is one, simple, and good. Bonaventure thinks that even such refined points as that a unity of nature is compatible with a plurality of Persons can also be established, even if one might never come to this position on one's own.

The ultimate metaphysical foundation for the thesis that truth is one is found in the doctrine that God is being. As Anton Pegis puts it: "it is that in the unity of a God Who is Being we have transcended the reign

---

[102] *Metaphysicus enim assurgit ad illud esse considerandum in ratione principii omnia originantis; et in hoc convenit cum morali sive ethico, qui reducit omnia ad unum summum bonum ut ad finem ultimum considerando felicitatem sive practicam, sive speculativam. Sed ut considerat illud esse in ratione omnia exemplantis cum nullo communicat et verus est metaphysicus* (Bonaventure, *Hex.*, 1, n. 13, 7–8 [5, 331]).

[103] *III Sent.*, d. 24, a. 2, q. 3 ad 4 (3, 524).

[104] *III Sent.*, d. 24, a. 2, q. 3 ad 4 (3, 524).

[105] *Quia inter creatorem et creaturam non potest tanta similitudo notari, quin inter eos maior sit dissimilitudo notanda* (Lateran Council IV, c. 2).

[106] *Deus autem et creatura nullum genus commune participant* (*III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 1, q. 1).

of *otherness* and *difference* within being. For we are in principle beyond the Platonic conflict between unity and intelligibility. We have reached a notion of being in which being and unity are reconcilable in the order of creatures because they are unified in God."[107]

We must now to turn to the question whether Bonaventure's philosophical teachings can constitute a philosophical system.

In essence, there is no doubt that Bonaventure is a philosophical theologian; he is, after all, a scholastic theologian. But the more immediate question is whether Bonaventure's philosophical views can constitute a coherent system. Van Steenberghen regarded Bonaventure as an eclectic theologian, who made use of philosophy, but who did not work to develop a philosophical system as a coherent set of theses concerning the truth of various philosophical questions.[108]

There was a long and vigorous debate between Gilson and Van Steenberghen. Van Steenberghen maintained over the course of a long career that Bonaventure developed a theological system (largely by reworking Augustine's theology to fit with eclectically chosen elements from Aristotle and Pseudo-Dionysius) without a systematic philosophy that could serve as its foundation. Gilson maintained that Bonaventure did produce such a philosophical system as the rational foundation for his systematic theology, and that, ultimately, he was like certain other contemporary schoolmen who developed great systems that were like "cathedrals of the mind." We see the blueprint for this cathedral, above all, in Bonaventure's *Reduction of the Arts to Theology* and in *Itinerarium*.

When you survey the range of theses established by arguments from reason in Bonaventure's philosophical considerations, they are considerable and reflect a significant confidence in reason—a moderate rationalism, we might even say. Reason can come to understand that the nature of the finite world is a composition of matter and form; that the contingent world had a beginning in time; that man is a rational animal; reason can attain the notion of being, and that being has certain transcendental properties, such as oneness, truth, goodness, and beauty; reason can come to know that God exists, and that he is the First Principle of the universe and the supreme being; that indeed, he is ultimately the True, the Good, Beauty itself. Reason can come to moral truths about the end of human

---

[107] Anton Pegis, "The Dilemma of Being and Unity: A Platonic Incident in Christian Thought," in *Essays in Thomism*, 183.

[108] Fernand van Steenberghen, *La théologie au XIII^e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris: 1991).

life, the precepts of the natural law, the conscience, and the importance of the virtues for happiness. In short, the list of truths accessible to philosophy is considerable. Bonaventure not only philosophizes on a few select questions, but he philosophizes on whole range of questions in such a way that his theses about God, man, and the universe constitute a coherent philosophical system. Bougerol expresses this point well: "Here the Neo-Platonism of Augustine meets the mysticism of Dionysius, the philosophy of Aristotle, even the cosmology of Avicenna. Yet the result is not eclectic: everything has been rethought and strongly unified by a powerful mind."[109] Indeed, the philosophic endeavor aims at a comprehensive unity of all knowledge, without contradiction or incoherence, in which is also found the coincidence of all opposites—a unity that can be attained only in that which is beyond limit and finitude. He is in this regard a systematic philosopher who has done more than develop a comprehensive worldview. This may be surprising to some readers.

The Limits of Reason

Bonaventure did not intend his philosophy to present us with the totality of wisdom. Gilson is surely correct in his account of Bonaventure's philosophy, that natural reason is extrinsically dependent on the light of revelation in order to perceive its errors, even if these be only the errors of omission. For it is scripture above all that allows the knower to attain such doctrines as original sin or the Trinity. There is no question that philosophy has need of a higher wisdom and light. Or to put it in terms of books, which Bonaventure himself does: the book of sacred scripture allows the believer to read rightly the book of creation. It is this latter book, when read as illumined by the light of faith, that most significantly decreases that darkness and obscurity. There are degrees of darkness and light. There is no all or nothing in the relationship between faith and reason. Nor is there any question that the certitude of faith is greater than that of reason. Bonaventure says, "The clarity of philosophical knowledge is great according to the worldly opinion of men; nevertheless it is small in comparison to the clarity of the Christian science (*scientia christiana*)."[110]

---

[109] Bougerol, 163.

[110] *Claritas scientiae philosophicae est magna secundum opinionem hominum mundialium, parva tamen est in comparatione ad claritatem scientiae christianae* (Bonaventure, *Collationes de donis Spiritus Sancti*, 4, 3 [5, 474]).

Philosophy is more likely to be mixed with error without the light of faith. "Nevertheless, this is true, that the doctrine of the faith was more truly handed on than some philosophical knowledge, because the Holy Spirit and Christ himself, who taught the truth of the faith and of sacred scripture, spoke falsely in no way and are able to be reprehended in no way."[111]

Yet, while not denying the value of revelation as an extrinsic norm for reason, Bonaventure seems to think that reason can discover its own limits quite apart from revelation. Reason itself can come to perceive its heteronomousness, even if it cannot also see the way to overcome this limit. In other words, Bonaventure's Christian philosophy is grounded not simply on the necessity of the light of faith for the human mind's fulfillment; it is grounded on the mind's ability to discover the intrinsic limits of reason alone.

Philosophy's ability to map out the limits of reason is considerable. For while reason can attain the truth that God exists, and that the human being, in his natural powers, is capable of God (*capax Dei*) and indeed has a natural desire for God—such that the intrinsic human powers cannot be fulfilled by anything less than God—it is also reason that perceives that an everlasting union with God remains beyond our ability to attain by our own power. Philosophy discloses, in other words, man's vanity—a vanity that consists not only in our contingency as "beings from nothing," but also in our inability to secure union with the object of our desires.[112] Reason is able to perceive its own insufficiency and incompetence with regard to that which is beyond our natural powers. The human being finds himself suspended over the deep—suspended between his own contingent finitude and the desire for an infinite being that remains beyond his reach. Philosophy's role, however, is not to avoid this journey "into the deep," but to pursue it, and so to elicit this desire by its inquiry into the soul and God.

Bonaventure seems to hold that philosophy, without the light of faith, is more likely to fall into errors, but the point of importance to note is that error is not necessary—it is simply likely, given the human condition

---

[111] *Istud tamen verum est, quod doctrina fidei magis veraciter est tradita, quam aliqua scientia philosophica, quia Spiritus sanctus et ipse Christus, qui docuerunt veritatem fidei et sacrae scripturae, in nullo falsum dixerunt nec in aliquot possunt reprehendi* (Bonaventure, *III Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 4 ad 4 [3, 482]).

[112] Bonaventure, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, 1, 12, trans. Campion Murray, O.F.M. and Robert J. Karris in *Works of Bonaventure* (Saint Bonaventure: 2005).

after the fall. In other words, there is a pessimism about the ability of reason to escape error, but it is a pessimism rooted not in the view that man's cognitional powers have been intrinsically wounded to such a degree that they can no longer fulfill their natural function. (Indeed, we have only to recall Bonaventure's optimism about reason's ability to find God hidden in every act of knowledge and in every being, as we saw in *De reductio*, to understand that the human intellect remains fundamentally sound.) Bonaventure's "pessimism" about the mind's ability to avoid error is rooted in the weakness of the will to adhere to a moral life. Philosophy apart from the light of revelation is likely to omit certain doctrines essential to understanding the human condition. The ancient philosophers, for example, did not know about original sin and the fall of man.

In a question from his *Commentary on the Sentences*, he asks whether the corruption that is in human nature was present to it from its primordial condition, or whether it was merited by sin. In the course of answering this question, Bonaventure explains that reason in inquiry (*ratio in inquirendo*) is able to proceed in two ways: either by reason aided by faith, in which case it proceeds by looking at the higher causes, or judgment left to itself, in which case it proceeds by looking at lower natures and causes. In the first way he thinks that the Catholic doctors and faithful judge (*ratiocinantur*) about those things which are of the faith, and, he adds, in this way many things are found consonant with reason. He gives as an example the fact that God did not make man from the beginning in such misery and calamity. In the second way, which Bonaventure explicitly says is the way that the philosophers (*philosophi*) proceed, they do not behold the principal Author, but they behold ordering principles and operations. In this way reason (*ratio*) may disagree more with Catholic truths than agree. The reason, Bonaventure explains, why the philosophers, although great searchers for truth (*veritatis indagatores*), did not come to know the fall of man, for example, was that it seems completely rational that the current human condition is the primordial condition.[113] Although it is the light of revelation, found in Genesis, that prompts us to see that the more eminently reasonable position is that God did not make man to be in such misery, Bonaventure thinks that the probability of reason (*rationis probabilitas*)

[113] *II Sent.*, d. 30, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (2, 716).

should lead us to see that God's justice, wisdom, and goodness require that he not create us in a state of misery.[114]

The doctrine of the *creatio ex nihilo* is one that looms large in Bonaventure's thought. Yet, in his early *Commentary on the Sentences*, we find him censuring the ancient philosophers for failing to discover this doctrine. Indeed, we find Bonaventure carefully presenting a sort of syllabus of the errors of the philosophers on this question. The philosophers on this question long walked "through byways."[115] So, for example, he says that certain ancient philosophers held the opinion that God made the world from his own essence, because they could not understand how something is able to come from nothing. Since they held that God was the sole principle, he must have made all things from himself. But Bonaventure points out this opinion does not accord with the faithful, nor did it agree with certain subsequent philosophers who came to understand that it is improbable (*improbabilis*) that God, whose essence is wholly unchangeable and most noble, might become the matter of corporeal and changeable things, which are clearly imperfect.[116] Another error on this question is that of Anaxagoras, who held that the world was made from preexisting principles, i.e., matter and form, and that the forms were latent in matter until Intellect separated and distinguished them. Yet another error found among the philosophers is that of the Platonists, who held that the world was made from preexisting principles, namely, matter and form, but that the Artificer (*opifice summo*) joined together matter and separated forms. Another error on the question of the creation of the world is that of the Peripatetics, "the prince and leader of whom was Aristotle," who came closer to the truth in that he seems to say that the world was made, but not from preexisting principles. Bonaventure is not sure (*nescio*) whether Aristotle held that matter and form were made from nothing, but he believes (*credo*) that he did not come to this view.[117] After having presented this syllabus of errors, Bonaventure says that where the expertise of the philosophers fails, holy scripture comes to our aid to teach us that the world was made from nothing.

We can find Bonaventure's realism about the limits of reason and pessimism about the human ability to pursue wisdom in its post-lapsarian

[114] *II Sent.*, d. 30, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (2, 715–716).
[115] *II Sent.*, d. 1, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (2, 16).
[116] *II Sent.*, d. 1, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (2, 6).
[117] *II Sent.*, d. 1, a. 1, q. 1 resp. (2, 16–17).

condition in his late work, the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*.[118] In their appraisal of Aristotle, these university sermons provide a considerable contrast with Bonaventure's earlier *Commentary*. There is no anti-Aristotelianism in the *Commentary*, or his other early works for that matter. This is not to say that Bonaventure treats Aristotle uncritically. But these *Collationes* on creation do reflect a very different style from that of Aristotle. Bonaventure's *Collationes* remain rooted in an ecclesial view of theology, strikingly different from the spirit of Aristotle.[119]

Bonaventure argues that the search for wisdom demands moral rectitude and grace, and these can be scarce for pilgrims who find themselves exiled from their homeland. Human beings once possessed knowledge and wisdom as gifts, but they lost these sapiential gifts after the first sin. They once could read the signs that make up the book of the created world, but now human beings are like illiterates trying to make out the meaning of a Greek text. They find the book of creation obscure and hard to read. They once saw through a glass clearly (although through a mirror, or *speculum clarum*, because creation was still not the beatific vision); now they can hope, at most, to see through a glass, darkly.

Bonaventure does not think the pursuit of wisdom is separable from the moral life, as if the human being were a disembodied mind. In his *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, he warns of the danger of pursuing knowledge apart from the quest for wisdom and holiness: "Concerning the levels of pride blessed Bernard says that the primary vice is inquisitiveness which brought about the fall of Lucifer. By this too Adam fell. The hunger for knowledge must be changed: wisdom and holiness must be preferred to it."[120] He then asks, "How then should one strive for knowledge, wisdom and holiness?" He lists four conditions for this endeavor: order, assiduity, satisfaction, and due proportion.

He recommends a proper order for learning that involves four kinds of books: sacred scripture, the original writings of the saints, the opinions of the masters, and fourth, the worldly teachings, that is, the doctrine of the philosophers.[121] This is the Bonaventurean library for the learned, wise, and holy person. Bonaventure then proceeds in the nineteenth collation

---

[118] *I Sent.*, d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 3 resp. (1, 4).

[119] Lohr, 80.

[120] *Beatus Bernardus dicit de gradibus superbiae, quod primum vitium est curiositas, per quod Lucifer cecidit; per hoc etiam Adam cecidit. Appetitus scientiae modificandus est, et praeferenda est ei sapientia et sanctitas* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 4, p. 285 [5, 420]).

[121] *Hex.*, 19, n. 6, p. 286 (5, 421).

to explain the value of each of these kinds of books. One kind is to lead to another. The primary texts of the saints are especially valuable in that they help explicate scripture, but "they are difficult." Therefore, there is need of the "summas of the masters." "But there is still greater danger in going down to the summas of the masters, because error is sometimes found in them."[122] Indeed, the masters sometimes do not understand the primary texts of the saints and even contradict them.

"But going down to philosophy implies the greatest danger."[123] Indeed, Bonaventure likens over-reliance on the philosophers to the Israelites returning to Egypt after the exodus. Bonaventure also likens over-reliance on the philosophers in the quest to understand sacred scripture to mixing so much water with one's wine that it turns from wine into water. "From this it is evident that for believers faith cannot proved by means of reason, but by means of scripture and miracles. Furthermore, in the primitive church, the faithful burned philosophy books."[124] Hence, Bonaventure reasons, given the dangers of error in philosophy books and the summas of the masters, that a right order of learning is essential. One should first study scripture, "in the letter and the spirit," then the primary texts of saints, giving priority to scripture over them. One must then be careful in reading over the masters and the philosophers: "One should scan them stealthily as if it were not good to tarry."[125]

Having finished his syllabus of books, Bonaventure proceeds in the nineteenth collation to insist upon the other conditions necessary for learning, wisdom, and holiness. Assiduity consists in ordered reading and learning. Haphazard reading produces an obstacle to the end of learning. Satisfaction consists in deep study, or chewing one's food, to use his example. (Bonaventure has in mind no doubt, the necessity of deep, meditative reading and assimilation of scripture in the tradition of *lectio divina*.) Good measure consists in attaining one's full potential in learning but not going beyond the capacity of one's intelligence.[126] Bonaventure proceeds to exhort "anyone who wishes to obtain advantage from his studies" to be

---

[122] *Maius autem periculum est decendere ad summas magistrorum quia aliquando est in eis error immo eis contradicunt* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 11, p. 289 [5, 422]).

[123] *Descendere autem ad philosophiam est maximum periculum* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 12, p. 290 [5, 422]).

[124] *Et hoc patet, quod credentibus fides non per rationem, sed per scripturam et miracula probari potest* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 14, p. 291 [5, 422]).

[125] *Sed transeundo et furando quasi ibi non sit permanendum* (Bonaventure, *Hex.*, 19, n. 15, p. 291 [5, 422]).

[126] *Hex.*, 19, n. 19, p. 293 (5, 423).

reverent, pure, religious, and edifying. Of particular interest among these virtues is purity, for by it Bonaventure means that "everything must be done out of love for God, and not out of love for something else, since all love is suspect if it is not addressed to God."[127]

Finally, Bonaventure insists that there should also be four further requisites for the one seeking wisdom. The first requisite is a recognition of one's inner defects. Interestingly, Bonaventure takes this to be a fulfillment of the command of Apollo to "know thyself" (*Recognosce te ipsum*). "Without this it is impossible to attain wisdom."[128] The further one advances in the pursuit of wisdom, the more one will despise oneself: "And this is the foremost expression of the zeal for wisdom, that a man persuade himself of his own defects and become humble in his own eyes."[129] Secondly, there must be a control of one's passions, which he considers the seven affective dispositions of the soul. In a passage quite reminiscent of the Stoics, Bonaventure presents lack of control of the passions as a form of childishness: "Likewise, a man should dominate and restrain these passions with a kind of judicial censure, so that when sorrow comes, he says to himself. 'Remain in peace.' "[130] Thirdly, there should be an ordering of one's thoughts, by which Bonaventure seems to mean a control of one's imagination. Fourthly, the zeal for wisdom requires an elevation of desire: "Now the zeal of wisdom consists in this, that our endeavor be directed toward nothing but God who is all delight."[131]

There is no question about whether philosophy will bring us salvation in Bonaventure's mind—it will not: "For with the philosophers there is no knowledge leading to the remission of sins."[132] Reason cannot "save" us. In this regard, Bonaventure stands unambiguously with Augustine, distinct from the ancient, and particularly the Platonist, tradition.[133] Reason cannot bring about our salvation (understood as the union of the soul with God in the beatific vision), for the reason that the human end is

---

[127] *Secundo, vita impolluta, quod totum faciat propter amorem Dei non propter amorem alicuius rei quia omnis amor suspectus est nisi Dei* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 21, p. 294 [5, 423]).

[128] *Sine hoc impossibile est venire ad sapientiam* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 24, p. 295 [5, 424]).

[129] *Et hoc est principalissimum studium sapientiae, ut sibi ipsi persuadeat homo suus defectus et fiat humilis in oculis suis* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 24, p. 295 [5, 424]).

[130] *Hex.*, 19, n. 25, p. 296 (5, 424): *Sic homo censura quadam iudicali debet domare et restringere huiusmodi passiones ut, quando venit dolor, dicatur sibi, sta in pace.*

[131] *Hoc est sapientis studium, ut non dediret stadium nostrum nisi ad Deum, qui est totus desiderabilis* (*Hex.*, 19, n. 27, p. 296 [5, 424]).

[132] *Hex.*, 19, n. 7, p. 286.

[133] See Michael L. Morgan, "Plato and Greek Religion," in *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, ed. Richard Kraut (New York: 1992), 227–47.

beyond what reason and philosophy can attain, namely, God. Recalling Bonaventure's enumeration of the various senses of wisdom, we can say that, insofar as "wisdom" is synonymous with grace and with the attainment of the beatifying vision of God, philosophy, as an activity of the human being, is doomed to failure. Indeed, no action or operation of the human being can, in itself, save us. In this sense, apart from grace, man is a vain creature, born in vanity, alive in the midst of vanities, and doomed to die in vanity.[134] The value of philosophy is not found in its hope of salvation, but in the pursuit, and attainment of some degree of wisdom for living life well.

Conclusion

One of the principal challenges for post-Enlightenment thought in Christian circles has been to articulate the relationship between faith and reason, philosophy and theology. The practice of turning to medieval theologians in order to find a useful account of this relationship receives perhaps its principal impetus from the fact that the scholastics attempted to articulate an understanding of this relationship that preserves the integrity of each discipline. This turning back to the medieval sources is now quite old; in Catholic circles, it received considerable impetus near the end of the nineteenth century from Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879), in which Leo explicitly references Bonaventure (as well as Aquinas) as a medieval theologian to whom we ought to return for an example of "a right use of that philosophy (. . .) which the scholastic teachers have been accustomed carefully and prudently to make use of even in theological disputations."[135] But there already existed considerable precedent for the practice that Leo XIII was advocating.[136] In this regard, the medieval turn should be seen as part of the larger *ressourcement*

[134] For a detailed examination of the theme of vanity, see Bonaventure's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*. Bonaventure discusses a threefold vanity in things: the vanity of mutability, of sin, and of guilt.

[135] Pope Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris* 16 (4 August 1879); see also 14.

[136] Indeed, scholars in the nineteenth century, such as Mateo Liberatore and Joseph Kleutgen, S.J., had made this "medieval turn," especially with respect to Aquinas. See Gerald McCool, S.J., *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century: The Quest for a Unitary Method* (New York: 1977).

("return to the sources") within Christian circles aimed at avoiding the extremes of Enlightenment secularism or of fideism.[137]

Bonaventure certainly attempts to provide us with a comprehensive and coherent account of this relationship. Indeed, if we place Bonaventure's view of philosophy on the spectrum of opinions about the possible relationship between philosophy and theology, we find that his is a moderate one. Bonaventure regards philosophy as a means to wisdom. Athens has quite a lot to do with Jerusalem, even if we think that Jerusalem is Wisdom's primary residence. Bonaventure is no fideist. Yet, he is also clearly no rationalist, whether of the type who thinks that philosophy alone is sufficient for wisdom or of the type who thinks that creedal propositions of the faith ought to be judged by reason. This is not to say, however, that the fullness of wisdom will be attained by reason alone. It certainly will not, in Bonaventure's view. But that reason can attain a partial, even if incomplete, wisdom is clear. On this point, it is valuable to bear in mind the comprehensive nature of Bonaventure's theory of wisdom. There is a way in which Bonaventure agrees with Augustine when he speaks of Christianity as "our philosophy" (*nostra philosophia*). But there is a way in which Bonaventure has gone beyond Augustine, insofar as he distinguishes arguments from faith from those of reason more sharply, more consistently, and more widely than Augustine ever does. This is Bonaventure the scholastic.

Bonaventure subscribes to the more general scholastic view that philosophy is ancillary—a servant or "handmaiden," as it is often called. As such, it is subject to the rule of another and in such a way that it cannot fulfill (bring to completion) its distinctive task of attaining wisdom without the aid of its mistress and ruler—the higher discipline of theology, the queen of the sciences. The implication of this view is often missed: theology in turn cannot fulfill its task of making the credible intelligible without the aid of philosophy. One of the results of this ancillary approach that sees philosophy as essential to the theological task is that theology itself is transformed into a system of related theses arising from the faith-based analysis of divine revelation, which is, in turn, founded upon a system of related theses arising from analysis of the traditional major issues of philosophy, i.e., God, man, and the universe. Bonaventure thus stands in the mainstream of medieval scholastic opinion.

---

[137] For a discussion of *Aeterni Patris* and its effects on the reading of medieval philosophy, see Rosemann, 2–5.

As possessing what might be called a "heteronomous integrity", Bonaventure holds that philosophy can accomplish its basic tasks without the aid of the higher discipline of theology, but he would insist that philosophy is not the highest wisdom available to the human being. Bonaventure not only regards theology as constituting a higher wisdom; he also thematizes the limits of reason—limits that are not only extrinsic to philosophy but also intrinsic to it.

That nature is distinct from grace is quite clear, in Bonaventure's view. But the natural processes of the human intellect are not comprehensible apart from divine illumination and are dependent on grace for their completion and perfection. Reason without a necessary openness to transcendence lacks absolute certitude, as one sees in Bonaventure's illumination theory. Faith safeguards reason from falling into error by establishing negative limits, but does not interfere in the internal process of reasoning. Bonaventure presents us with philosophy as an integral, yet conditionally autonomous, discipline.

No finite mind can transverse the breadth of wisdom nor plumb its depths, now or ever. This understanding of the limits of reason distinguishes Bonaventure and the scholastics in general from the rationalist systems of modern philosophy.[138] Indeed, the fullness of wisdom is ultimately "nulliform," beyond any human concepts or propositions. "Finally, wisdom prepares for peace, because wisdom unites us to the supreme True and Good in whom all our rational desires find their end and their repose."[139]

[138] Rosemann, 15.
[139] *Brev.*, 5, 6 (5, 259).

THEOLOGY

BONAVENTURE AS EXEGETE

Jacques Guy Bougerol[1]

To the modern reader, the scriptural works of Saint Bonaventure may seem to be of limited interest. Yet the Seraphic Doctor's theological and scriptural studies and labors give these biblical commentaries a value which attentive reading will reveal. Before presenting these works, it may be well to indicate the place that scripture occupies in Bonaventure's theology, and his understanding of how it should be studied.

The Place of Scripture in Bonaventure's Theology

The theological renewal that reached its height in the thirteenth century had its beginnings much earlier. Two names dominate the thought of the eleventh century: St Anselm, whose lofty dissertations had a definite influence on Bonaventure; and the Venerable Bede, whose humble and dogged work contributed greatly to the Carolingian civilization.[2] Both were pioneers in the elaboration of theology; they were also primarily responsible for the renewed interest in biblical studies. And following the Third Lateran Council (1179), the work they had fathered ceased to be confined to a few specialists who took over the labor of the monastic schools. After Hugh of St Victor and his disciples Richard and Andrew,[3] the masters in *sacra pagina* Peter Comestor,[4] Peter Cantor,[5] and Stephen Langton[6] had continued the renovation of biblical exegesis.

---

[1] This essay is reproduced in part with permission from Franciscan Institute Publications. It originally appeared in English as J. Guy Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson, N.J.: 1964). The essay has been edited with updated bibliographic annotation by Jay M. Hammond and Jared Goff.

[2] Martin Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, Vol. 2 (Freiburg: 1909), 476ff; see Joseph De Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (Bruges: 1948), 90.

[3] Jacques Châtillon, "L'Ecole de Saint-Victor," *Communio* 6 (1981): 63–76.

[4] Also called the *Manducator* or the Eater; see *DTC*, "Pierre Manducator"; see also Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, ed. 3a, t. 2I, prolegomena (Grottaferrata: 1981), 39–44.

[5] Also called the Singer; see *DTC*, "Peter Cantor."

[6] See Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: 1952); Joseph De Ghellinck, "Pagina et sacra Pagina. Histoire d'un mot et transformation de l'objet primitivement désigné," in *Mélanges A. Pelzer* (Louvain: 1947), 23–59; Marie Dominic Chenu,

St Francis and St Dominic, in turn, add their own stimulus to the movement. Their followers, by living in their spirit, carry the revivifying quality of the New Testament throughout Christendom. Let us recall the deep reasons which led Bonaventure to join the Friars Minor: his vocation had an entirely evangelical meaning. This "return to the Gospel" will have a considerable influence upon the development of biblical studies. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, scriptural teaching overflows from the monasteries; the students of the university eagerly gather around the chairs of those who "purvey spirit and life,"[7] the masters in *sacra pagina*.

But such an evolution implies a change in the technique of exegesis. There is definitely a swing away from the simple commented reading of the Bible (*lectio* or *lectura*) to a more complete teaching. The very history of the expression *sacra pagina* is revealing. *Sacra pagina* no longer designates the Bible alone, "but is now enriched with a whole complex of notions that arise from the 'question' and become the matter for study and teaching different from purely scriptural knowledge."[8] As used by St Augustine and St Gregory, the "questions" are intended to explain obscure passages of a given scriptural book or of a series of scriptural books. They now go beyond this original program to cover "problems which have nothing to do with properly scriptural matters."[9]

But a further change may be noted. The term *sacra pagina* is used, it is true, in the pontifical letters of Innocent III, Honorius III, and Gregory IX, and occurs also in Sweden, in Ireland, and in Italy (Bologna) as late as 1364. But neither Robert Grosseteste in Oxford nor Roger Bacon in Paris, nor Bonaventure himself, ever makes use of it. Other expressions have replaced it completely.[10] Bonaventure prefers *sacra scriptura*.[11] Later, we shall consider the meaning of this term which, as he uses it, extends far beyond the domain proper to exegesis.

Despite these developments and changes, however, the Bible always remains the basic book for the theological teachings of the masters.[12]

"Evangélisme et théologie au XIII^{e} siècle," in *Mélanges F. Cavallera* (Toulouse, 1948), 339–346; see Peter Lombard, *Libri IV Sententiarum studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae in lucem editi*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Quaracchi: 1916), 44–52.

[7] St Francis, *Testament* in *Opuscules* (Paris: 1955), 149.

[8] De Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique*, 40.

[9] De Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique*, 54, 56.

[10] For Roger Bacon, see *Opus min.* (abt. 1267), ed. John S. Brewer (London: 1859), 328. For Bonaventure, see *Brev.*, prol. (5.201); see Arduin Kleinhans, "Der Studiergang der heil. Schrift im XIII. u. XIV Jahrhundert," *Biblia* 14 (1933): 385–386.

[11] See Table of the *Opera omnia* at the word *scriptura*.

[12] Ghellinck, *Le mouvement theologique*, 59; Smalley, *The Study*, xv.

While the sweetness of the Victorines and the unction of Saint Bernard were gradually eliminated from the technique of teaching, it was the program elaborated by Hugh of St Victor in his *Didascalicon* which was fulfilled by the three masters in *sacra pagina* whose names are mentioned above. Peter Cantor is a witness to this: "The teaching of scripture consists in three things: reading, disputation, and preaching (…). The reading is the foundation (…), the disputation provides the walls (…), preaching is the roof."[13]

Peter Comestor in particular played an important part in the thirteenth century. His *Historia scholastica*, supplementing the biblical *Glossae* and the *Sentences*, provided a historical view of mankind's religious destiny. Both in Oxford and in the schools of the Preachers, the *Historia* was a basic textbook.[14] In Paris and among the Friars Minor, the Bible alone was imposed upon masters and students, though the *Historia* was often quoted.

The exegetical method of Stephen Langton has a threefold division: first, he seeks to perfect the technique of moralizing exegesis in order to assist preachers; then, he attempts to bring to light the true and complete teaching of the criptures; finally, he shows his students how to handle the complicated machinery of the *Glossae*: to distinguish the letter from the tropological meaning, by comparing the various readings of the *Glossae* and of the text, in order to attain a better understanding of the scriptures themselves.[15]

The exegetical tradition originated by Langton will be followed by the masters until the appearance of the mendicants, who initiate further changes in the character of scriptural teaching. They are less interested in tropological conclusions than in biblical theology. While homiletics remains for them the scholar's true goal in teaching the Bible ("The purpose of expounding and teaching the Gospel of God is to preach the divine word"),[16] the foremost aim of the mendicant masters is to prepare, not future teachers, but future priests and pastors of souls: yet, by taste as much as by necessity, they seek in the careful study of scriptures to find the building blocks of a theology.

---

[13] *Verbum abbreviatum*, c. 1 (PL, 205, 25).
[14] See Kleinhans, *Der Studiergang*, 390.
[15] See Smalley, *The Study*, 267.
[16] Bonaventure, *Comm. Luc*, prooem., n. 5 (7.4). Compare this text with that of Peter Cantor.

There is a notable difference between the Preachers and the Friars Minor in the technical process of exposition. At Saint-Jacques, the masters, under the guidance of Hugh of St Cher,[17] dwell at length on the revision and correction of the text before they proceed to the reading of it. The Friars Minor of Paris, from John of Rochelle onward,[18] prefer to begin with an exposition and to study theological questions after the text is read.

In the year 1243, when Bonaventure, clothed in the habit of the Friars Minor, began his theological studies, his first two years, according to the statute adopted by almost every university in the Christian world, were planned to cover a biblical cycle during which the Bible would be read *cursorie*. After two more years, dedicated to the study of the *Book of Sentences* of Peter Lombard, there came a second biblical cycle during which the teaching of a master was received in the form of a more profound exegesis of one or other of the sacred books.

The first biblical cycle, then, was a limited initiation. Bonaventure employed the opportunity given during these first two years to meditate on the scriptures with such attention and fervor that, in later years, biblical quotations crop up quite naturally in his works. A single word suffices to call to his mind a biblical text, or a whole series of texts. The scriptural indexes of his works are proof of this. To be sure, concordances existed at the time,[19] but their effective use depended upon an understanding of God's word.[20]

Bonaventure covered his first biblical cycle in 1243–1245, the cycle of the *Sentences* in 1245–1247, and the second biblical cycle in 1247–1249. He thereupon obtained the degree of Biblical Bachelor and began in turn to read the Bible *cursorie* with younger students. "Every bachelor, before reading [expounding] the *Sentences*, must read [expound] the Old and

---

[17] Hugh of St Cher taught in Saint-Jacques from 1230 to 1235. After becoming Provincial, then Cardinal, he continued to supervise the Biblical School he had founded.

[18] See Ceslas Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Age*, (Paris: 1944), 144–145; Palémon Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris XIII^e^ seècle*, vol. 2 (Paris: 1934), 27; Ferdinand Delorme, "Deux leçons d'ouverture de cours biblique données par Jean de la Rochelle," *France franciscaine* (1933), 345–360.

[19] Robert Grosseteste and Richard Kildwarby were the best known authors of concordances. It seems that in Saint-Jacques Hugh of St Cher worked at a concordance of his own; see Smalley, *The Study*, 334.

[20] Spicq, *Esquisse*, 223: "Medieval exegetes were comparable to living concordances: one biblical sentence recalled automatically all the other sentences which expressed the same ideas or contained the same words." Cf. *Brev*., prol., c. 6 (5, 207–208).

New Testaments for a period of two years. He will receive no dispensation for any reason whatsoever."[21]

The secular bachelors, called *Cursores*, were expected to "read" one of the books of the Old or New Testament. The mendicants, on the contrary, "read" the whole Bible. For that purpose, they made use of the notes they had taken during their own six student years, and the commentaries they could find in the libraries of their master or their monastery.

With what text of the Bible did Bonaventure work? From the few studies on the question,[22] it would seem to have been the text endorsed in 1226 by a committee of doctors of the University of Paris—the Bible with *Glossae*,[23] that is, the text interspersed with paraphrases and commentaries. It was called *Biblia de littera et apparatu parisiensi*.[24]

Roger Bacon desired to reinstate the original text of Saint Jerome, i.e., the Vulgate, and begged the Pope to establish a commission of competent masters for the purpose.[25] But it was the Dominican Hugh of St Cher who began this extensive work and published a *Correctorium* based on the notations of Stephen Langton and Andrew of St Victor, though far superior in its critical standards. The most scientific *Correctorium* is that which the Franciscan William de la Mare composed while he was regent in Paris in the years 1274–1275.[26]

The origins of the *Glossae* which accompany the Parisian text are imperfectly known and obscure.[27] According to Beryl Smalley, the *Glossae* are a complex of work by different authors whose contributions are established with varying degrees of probability. Anselm of Laon undoubtedly

---

[21] *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. Heinrich Denifile and Emile Chatelain, vol. 2 (Paris: 1891), 699 n. 28.

[22] Smalley, *The Study*, 331, 334; see Jean-Pierre-Paulin Martin, "La Vulgate latine au XIII[e] siècle," *Museon* 7 (1888): 83–169, 278–381. Martin, "Le texte parisien de la Vulgate Latine," *Museon* 8 (1889): 444, and 9 (1890): 55–301.

[23] See the notes on the *Glossa*, below.

[24] See Antonio Maria Iosa, *I codici manuscritti della Biblioteca Antoniana di Padova* (Padua: 1886), 48–49.

[25] See *Opus minus*, ed. Brewer, 337, 353; *Compendium studii*, 459; Smalley, *The Study*, 332.

[26] See Theophilus Witzel, "De fr. Rogero Bacon eiusque sententia de rebus biblicis," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 201; Heinrich Denifile, "Die Handschrift der Bibel-Correctien des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* 4 (1868): 263–311, 471–601. We find the *Correctorium* of William de la Mare in several manuscripts, two of which bear his name: Einsiedeln 28 and Firenze, Laur Plut. XXV sin. cod. 4.

[27] See Smalley, *The Study*, 44–46, and above all her "La Glossa ordinaria," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 4 (1937): 372–399; De Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique*, 104–112; J. de Blic, "L'oeuvre exégétique de Walfrid Strahon et la *Glossa ordinaria*," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 16 (1949): pp. 5–28.

had the major share in their compilation. He was apparently the original author of both the *Glossa interlinearis*, which refers to explanations of words of the sacred text, and the *Glossa ordinaria*, or marginal gloss, which explains whole passages by quoting the fathers and other authors declared to be "authorities." Peter Lombard assured the success of these glosses by imposing them as part of the biblical studies in the University of Paris.[28] Thenceforth, they had authority.[29]

Let me offer one last word on a few technical expressions used in the middle ages in a sense that needs to be clearly specified.

The terms *glossa* and *glossula* are reserved to designate the marginal and interlinear glosses. A *glossarium* is a summary of the *glossa*.

Postilla seems to be derived from the expression *post illa verba*, used by the reader to introduce the commentary of a text he has just read. The term in fact designates all the commentaries that insert a brief exposition between scriptural passages or *loci*.[30]

Expositio and *lectura* are also used, but their meaning has not yet been fully elucidated.

We may now question Bonaventure about the place he intended scripture to have in his theology.

Among the texts in which he has given us his thoughts, we shall select, as the one most directly devoted to the question we are now studying, the prologue of the *Breviloquium*.

Bonaventure's goal in composing this treatise was twofold. He sought, first of all, to show the masters that the whole of revealed doctrine is contained in Scripture. But he noted that to extract it entails arduous labor, and that the commentaries of fathers and doctors are very lengthy; at the request of his brothers in religion, therefore, he has composed this summary of theological truth, to which "some explanatory notes (reasons) have been added as they suggested themselves in the course of the writing."[31]

There was a second purpose as well. The young theologians, less attentive, perhaps, than their elders to the reading of the sacred books and more tempted by the *Sentences* or the *Disputed Questions*, or even by philosophy in general, were losing all taste for scripture itself. They found it

---

[28] Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, I, prolegomena, 46–88.

[29] This fact still needs to be established with certainty; see De Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique*, 112. On the "authorities," see Marie Dominique Chenu, *La théologie au XII^e siècle*, 353–358. On "authentica," see ibid., 358ff.

[30] Smalley, *The Study*, 270.

[31] Bonaventure, *Brev.*, prol., c. 6, n. 5 (5, 208).

"confusing, orderless and uncharted as an impenetrable forest." Bonaventure, then, sought to remind these students of the prime importance of scripture, and to initiate them into the literary styles and characteristic methods of the biblical books.

The body of the *Breviloquium*, divided into seven parts, corresponds to the first purpose. The second purpose led to the prologue, which combines three distinct elements: a short introduction showing the importance of scripture, its origin, methodology, and culmination; the body of the prologue, which constitutes the most complete treatise on hermeneutics produced in the Middle Ages; and, finally, the exposition of the author's purpose.

As a theme for his introduction, Bonaventure chooses Eph. 3:14–19:

> For this reason I bow my knees before the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom all fatherhood in heaven and on earth takes its name, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened through his Spirit with power in your inner being, and that may Christ dwell in your hearts through faith; that, being rooted and grounded in love, you may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length, height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which surpasses all knowledge, so that you may be filled with all the fullness of God.[32]

Commenting on this text, as he does when explaining the theme of one of his sermons or collations, or that of his prologue to the *Commentaries on the Sentences*, Bonaventure discovers in it the foundations of scriptural teaching: *sacra scriptura, quae theologia dicitur*.[33]

The teaching of the master consists in reading and explaining the scriptures, the revelation of the Father. He fulfills this task, not as he would expound the text of some human author, but by referring to the divine origin of the word. The "inner man" is at work in that master who, from the light Christ brings to him by living in his heart, draws the strength to understand the revelation of the Father and to hand it on to others. For Bonaventure, the theologian must seek wisdom; theology must be within the theologian, "a pious knowledge of the truth apprehended by faith,"[34] before becoming the same pious knowledge in those who receive his teaching.

---

[32] Translation from Bonaventure, *Breviloquium: Works of St. Bonaventure*, vol. 9, trans. Dominic Monti (Saint Bonaventure: 2005), 1.

[33] *Brev.*, prol., n. 1 (5, 201).

[34] *De don. Spir.*, col. 4, n. 5 (5, 474).

The character which Bonaventure attributes to the scriptures explains in part why he uses indifferently the expressions *sacra scriptura* and *theologia* to indicate both the study and the teaching of the Bible. *Sacra scriptura* signifies at one and the same time the material object of theology, that is, the text of the Bible, and the work of faith reflecting upon itself. In this second sense, Bonaventure considers theology to be a science, because it concerns a pattern of organized knowledge.

Finally, the master discovers in this text how the study and teaching of the scriptures reaches its culmination in the faithful soul. The scriptures are the word of eternal life, of which we possess the seed in this world. By studying the word and practicing it, the theologian is directing himself toward eternal beatitude, which is to be his fulfillment. We see now why Bonaventure considers theology as a stage in the soul's ascent toward wisdom: the last step before the vision of heaven.

Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures

In his prologue to *the Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*,[35] Bonaventure expounds his ideas concerning the master and the pupil.

The master must work in the light of grace. The scriptures need to be studied and explained in the same spirit in which the word of God was revealed to us.

Also, the master must have been established by authority. As Moses received from God the command to lead the sons of Israel to the Promised Land, so the master receives from the church the mandate to lead the people of the Lord out of the darkness of ignorance toward the knowledge of Jesus Christ. The greatness of his mission towers over him from all sides. He cannot presume on his personal strength: it is the church, the mistress of truth, that empowers him, and thereby opens his spirit to the light he needs to fulfill his mission.

Finally, by teaching the Gospel of God, the master is both teacher and apostle. He must be moved by zeal for God's house and by a brotherly love for souls.

The pupil, too, receives his proper directives. He must, says Bonaventure, approach the study of the scriptures in a spirit of deep submission, as a true disciple of Christ, meek and humble of heart. He must also prepare

[35] *Opera omnia* (7, 3–11).

himself to receive the teaching of the master with a cleansed mind, so that grace may enlighten his study. Finally, he must assent to the teaching with faith and intellectual humility.

Introduction to the Study Proper[36]

The introduction to the study of the scriptures includes two operations: measuring the dimensions of the revealed word and investigating its method. In his exposition, Bonaventure follows the plan the Apostle gives in the text we have quoted in the preceding section.[37]

Their Breadth

The breadth of scripture consists in the whole extent of the sacred books. The classification Bonaventure presents is apparently adopted from John of Rochelle.[38] The Old Testament grouping is: five legal books, ten historical, five sapiential and six prophetical: twenty-six books in all. The New Testament grouping corresponds to this, with four legal books, the Gospels; one historical, the Acts; twenty-one sapiential, the Epistles; and one prophetical, the Apocalypse.

The division into two Testaments is the only one that befits the Bible. We cannot apply to it the philosophical division of theory and practice, for the scriptures, founded on the knowledge that comes by faith, are, throughout their entire course, at one and the same time a rule of knowledge and a form of life. By the breadth of the books they contain, the scriptures are the voice of the Holy Spirit giving to the church of Christ the whole doctrine of the truth necessary to salvation.

Their Length

The scriptures present a supernatural vision of world history, describing the times of the law of nature, the written law, and the law of grace. Here,

---

[36] We comment here on the prologue to the *Breviloquium* (5, 202–208).

[37] Eph. 3:14–19.

[38] Two "principia" of John of Rochelle survive in the Paris manuscript B.N. nouv. acqu. lat. 1470, fol. 147. They were edited by Ferdinand Delorme, "Duex leçons d'ouverture de cours biblique donnés par Jean de la Rochelle," *France Franciscaine* 16 (1933): 345–360. See Spicq, *Esquisse*, p. 148.

Bonaventure is repeating what Augustine taught[39] about the ages of the world, showing how the scriptures portray the order of creation from its origin to its fulfillment. This part of the *Breviloquium* is a long and magnificent poem that sings the variety, unity, beauty, and order of the divine decrees.

If one is to understand the course of creation, one's eye must embrace the whole of it. And since the shortness of life prevents one from doing this, the scriptures are given so that one may see through them the order of the whole.

Their Height

The scriptures describe the progressive hierarchy of things: the ecclesiastical, the angelical, and the heavenly.[40]

Things, indeed, exist in themselves. In a sense, they also exist in our souls, when we know them naturally, or when faith reveals them to us, or again when we see them in the state of glory. They exist, furthermore, in "eternal art." Philosophy has for its object things considered in themselves or in the knowledge we have of them, whether innate or acquired. Theology, being a science founded on faith and having for its material object the scriptures revealed by the Holy Spirit, has for its formal object all things related to grace, to the vision of glory, and to eternal wisdom.

There is a bond between these two sciences. Theology makes use of philosophy to construct the mirror in which the things of God are represented, or, as Bonaventure expresses it in the *De reductione*,[41] to build up faith. It resembles Jacob's ladder, which rests on earth but reaches up to heaven.

In the light of faith, in which it grows, theology is the work of the one hierarch, Jesus Christ. For he alone, by reason of his human nature, is hierarch in the ecclesiastical and the angelical hierarchies, and, by reason of his divine nature, is the "center" of the supracelestial hierarchy of the Holy Trinity. Through him, grace descends from the Father upon the

---

[39] Augustine, *De Genesi ad litt.*, 1. 4, c. 11, n. 21 (PL 34, 303–304); see Auguste Luneau, *L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Eglise: la doctrine des âges du monde* (Paris: 1964); Joseph Ratzinger, *Die Geschichtstheologie des hl. Bonaventura* (Munich: 1959).

[40] The influence of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite is apparent here; see II *Sent.*, d. 9, praenot. (2, 237–241). See Jacques G. Bougeral, "Saint Bonaventure et la hiérarchie dionysienne," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 36 (1969): 131–67.

[41] *Red art.*, n. 26 (5, 325).

church, leading it to seek understanding in the things of faith through the study of theology.[42]

Their Depth

The depth of the scriptures consists in the multiplicity of the meanings which the word of God may possess. The literal sense, that which derives from the text itself, as it is written, is the fundamental sense and the basis of scriptural teaching. But besides this, appeal may be made also to the allegorical sense, the tropological sense, and the anagogical sense.

The allegorical sense emerges when the text produces, so to speak, an image calling to mind a reality that is an object of faith. The tropological sense exists when from the text there arises some definition of what ought to be done. The anagogical sense, finally, lifts up the mind toward the eternal good for which we hope.

This fourfold sense of scripture is perfectly fitted to the matter it covers. Bonaventure's position is made clear by his use of the Dionysian themes[43] when he teaches that the object of scriptures is fourfold:[44] God, insofar as the scriptures are his revealed word; Christ, insofar as he manifests God's power; redemption, insofar as it is God's work; faith, insofar as it is the light in which revelation is received.

The depth of the scriptures is due to their origin and to the purpose for which they were revealed to us. Their origin is God himself speaking through the Holy Spirit and through Christ, in the various books, each of which is a human transcription of what God said and did.

The purpose for which God revealed them to us is that, through them, we may grasp what we must know in order to act rightly and thus attain eternal life.

This is how the wisdom of God tells us what we must believe, what we must do, and what we must desire.

---

[42] *Brev*., prol., n. 2 (5, 205).

[43] Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Hierarchia caelestis*, c. 2, n. 2 (Dionysiaca, 787–794); cf. Alexander of Hales, *Summa*, p. 1, q. 1, m. 3 (1, 8). Bonaventure presents a different aspect of the question in I *Sent*., prooem., q. 1 (1, 6–8).

[44] We translate *subjectum* by object.

Methodology of the Scriptures

The scriptures, as we have said, are not only to be known: they must also incline our will to act rightly. For this reason, they speak to us through examples rather than through arguments. Promises are more persuasive than reasoning; it is more important for the Bible to appeal to devotion than to definition. Everyone finds there what is needed, and everyone may even find, in the same text but in different circumstances, what will best fit each circumstance to answer the Lord's call.

That is why scripture relies less heavily on rational certitude than on the transcending authority of God who reveals it. It is his authentic word. Nothing is superfluous in the scriptural text: everything predicted will be fulfilled to the last iota. He who only teaches scripture to others shall be little in the kingdom of heaven; but he who both teaches and follows it shall be great in the kingdom of heaven.

How to Expound the Scriptures

The scriptures must be understood and taught in accordance with the method by which they were given. Hence a theologian in charge of scriptural teaching must have assimilated the sacred text to such a degree that the various passages are correlated in his mind and explain one another. In this way he will bring out the different senses of God's word, and will ground the truth of faith upon the authority of the Holy Spirit.

Of course, like all medieval theologians, Bonaventure knew the Bible almost by heart: at least, he could always bring to mind a text containing a word already presented by another text.[45] More importantly, the study of the literal sense required research into how the human author transmits the revelation of God. So when Bonaventure expounded upon the discourses of Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk. 4:16–30), he noted that the same episode is related as occurring much later in Matthew (13:53–58), and is only very briefly narrated by Mark (6:1–6). In addition, Luke has, on the lips of Jesus, the text of Isaiah that we saw in the theme of the prologue. Bonaventure entrusted to Jesus the exegesis of the text. Bonaventure writes:

> One must realize that the Evangelist is not following the order of Jesus activities, but the sequence of his intended purposes, and that he does this many

[45] The expression is taken verbatim from St Athanasius, *Vita Antonii* (PG 73, 128).

> times. And therefore, when one Evangelist narrates that this happened afterwards and another that it happened before, there is no disagreement. For they do not intend to say that the order in which the events are written is the order in which these events took place.[46]

To encourage his students in the difficult endeavor of understanding and interpreting scripture, Bonaventure reminds them of the rules given by St Augustine,[47] and above all he recalls as a golden rule that the only key able to open the whole mystery of Jesus Christ is the cross: Now these profound mysteries in scripture no one understands but Christ crucified, risen and proclaimed to the Gentiles by the Holy Spirit. For it is said in Revelation that *the risen lion* and *the slaughtered lamb* opened the book.[48]

The Commentaries

Problems of Authenticity

According to the Quaracchi editors, the exegetical works of St Bonaventure are five in number, but may be grouped in three categories on the basis of differences in the techniques of reading and exposition:

1. A *Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*, dating from the magistral period.
2. Postillae on Ecclesiastes, the Book of Wisdom, and the Gospel of Saint John: the works of the Biblical Bachelor period.
3. Collations on the Gospel of St John, which are more in note or sermon outline form than properly exegetical.

In the Prolegomena to Vol. 6 of the *Opera omnia*, the editors sought to unravel the problem of the authenticity of the scriptural works of St Bonaventure.

But their enterprise was rendered impossible because they had also been given the task of improving the Vatican edition of 1596. To accomplish this, they needed to go through the various Vatican editions, address

---

[46] Bonaventure, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: Works of Saint Bonaventure*, vol. 8, part 1, trans. Robert J. Karris (Saint Bonaventure: 2001), 333.

[47] Augustine, *De Doctr. christ.*, 1. 3, c. 10, n. 14ff. (PL 34, 71–72).

[48] Bonaventure, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, vol. 8, part 3, trans. Robert J. Karris (Saint Bonaventure: 2004), 2239. Cf., Henri de Lubac, "*Exégèse médiévale*, vol. 2/2 (Paris: 1964), 263–272.

the diatribes of Casimir Oudin and sift through the criticisms of Bonelli, who in 1767, had published lengthy prolegomena to an edition that came only partly, in Supplements.[49]

Among the possible witnesses, the editors cited the list of Paris dating from 1275–1286. This list was already known by Echard and published in the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*. New manuscripts, however, have since been discovered which I have used to draw firmer conclusions with respect to Bonaventure's authorship:

MSS: London. B.L. add. 17304, fol. 102r–104v (=L).
Vatican, Reg. lat. 406, fols. 66–68 (=R).
Vienna. Nat. Bibl. 7219, fols. 3976–403 (=W).

Haec sunt scripta fratris Bonaventurae de ordine fratrum minorum. scilicet

Postillae super Lucam, continent pecias 73, 3 sol.
Item, eiusdem super Ecclesiasten, 12 pecias, 6 den. (L=7 den.).
[Item, Postillae super Canticum canticorum, 18 pecias, 8 den. (R=13 pecias).
Item, Postillae super librum Proverbiorum, continent pecias 37, 20 den. (R=27 pecias; L=25 den.)
Item, super Cantica canticorum, 15 pecias, 8 den. (L=25 pecias).
Item, super librum Sapientiae, 10 pecias, 6 den.
Item, Postillae super Apocalypsim, 23 pecias, 15 den.
Item, Postillae super Epistolas canonicas, 15 pecias, 8 den.]

Item, super Sententias, pro primo, 2 sol.
pro secundo, 4 sol.
pro tercio, 2 sol. (W=6 sol.).
pro quarto, 2 sol. (W=6 sol.).

This list raises several questions:

– It makes no mention of the Postillae *super Ioannem*, which, however, is genuine and is found in manuscripts with signs of pecia.

[49] Benedictus Bonelli a Cavalesio, *Prodromus ad Opera omnia S. Bonaventurae* (Bassano: 1767); *S. Bonaventurae Operum omnium Supplementum*, 3 vols. (Trent: 1772–1774).

– We do not yet know the *incipits* of the two Postillae *super Cantica canticorum*, the Postillae *super librum Proverbiorum, super Apocalypsim* and *super Epistolas Canonicas.*
– The Postillae *super librum Sapientiae* published by the editors[50] are not authentic.

The list of the works that are outside the brackets includes the Postillae *super Lucam* and *super Ecclesiasten*, as well as the four commentaries *In Sententias*.

It is certain that the *Repertorium biblicum* of Frederic Stegmüller lists more anonymous comments, rather than attributing works to the various authors with certainty.[51] It will take a great deal of research before it can be determined whether the Paris list relates historical reality or whether it has interpolations that mix Bonaventure's works with those of other masters.

St Luke

Brother Salimbene tells us, in his *Chronicle*, that "Brother John of Parma gave formal license to Brother Bonaventure of Bagnoregio to 'read' in Paris, which he had not done heretofore as he was a bachelor not yet installed in his chair; and so he 'read' a very beautiful and perfect commentary on the whole Gospel of St Luke: this was in 1248."[52]

We agree with the Quaracchi editors that, in its present condition, the *Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke* is a text that has been revised for a very definite purpose. This *Commentary*, which implies the maturity of spirit of a master rather than of a bachelor, fills Vol. 7 of the *Opera omnia*. It reveals Bonaventure as being strongly concerned with the formation of future preachers. He places at their disposal the wealth of his knowledge and thought, and he writes for them a book that is as deep in its inspiration as it is clear in its exposition.

The apparently historical form of the text written by Salimbene around 1280 misled the Quaracchi editors. It is certain that John of Parma, as

---

[50] *Opera omnia* (6, 107–233).

[51] Frederic Stegmüller, *Reportorium biblicum medii aevi*, vol. 1 (Madrid: 1940); vol. 2 A–G (1950); vol. 3 H–M (1951); vol. 4 N–Q (1954); vol. 5 R–Z (1955); vol. 6 Anonyma, A–O (1958); vol. 7 Anonyma, P–Z (1961); vol. 8 Supplementum (1976); vol. 9 Supplementum (1977); vol. 10 Initia, A–K (1979); vol. 11 Initia, L–Z (1980). The commentaries identified range from n. 1 to 8400; the anonymous commentaries from n. 8401 to 11780.

[52] Salimbene, *Chronica*, ed. Holder-Egger, MGH 1/32 (Hanover: 1905–1908), 299.

Minister General, had the right to license because, after Alexander of Hales became a Friar Minor, the university recognized a Franciscan chair. The University did not name the *cathedraticus*, but left it to the authorities of the order to choose a qualified candidate. Bonaventure, says Salimbene, was a bachelor and had not yet "read." This, however, is incorrect, because the Biblical Bachelor not only began to "read," but also asked and resolved questions. The Postillae *super Lucam* are found in two forms in the manuscripts: the first is the "lectio" of a Biblical Bachelor, the second is that of a master. The state in which the Postillae were published in the *Opera omnia* represent the second form. The date of 1248, thus, does not concern this text, for Bonaventure, as regent master between 1254–1257, resumed this Postilla and transformed it into *materia praedicabilis*, to be used by preachers. The questions have disappeared and the presentation assumes a clear intention, as the Postilla on ch. 9, n. 1–28, the *Forma praedicandi*, states:

> Now there are three types of evidence that the preacher is sent forth by the Lord to preach the Gospel. First is *the authority* of the one sending, be this of the bishop or especially of that bishop who takes the place of Peter, who for his part takes the place of Jesus Christ. So the person sent by him is sent by Christ. Second is *the zeal for souls* in the person who is sent, when that individual's primary goal is the honor of God and the salvation of souls. Third, the preaching brings forth *good fruit and conversion* in the listeners.—By means of the first sign they are heralds of the Father, by the second heralds of the Son, and through the third heralds of the Holy Spirit.[53]

At the end of these pages that are so rich in meaning, Bonaventure summarizes his thinking:

> From this a lesson is provided for preachers that they should not search out new things from their hearts, for the Lord did not create new loaves to feed the crowd. But as the Lord multiplied five barley loaves by means of a divine blessing, so too is every abundance of true teaching taken from *the foundation of Sacred Scripture*, multiplied by *prayer*, through which one looks to heaven, and *devotion*, through which it is blessed, and *meditation*, through which it is broken, and *preaching*, through which it is distributed and explained.[54]

It is clear from reading the Postillae *super Lucam*, that Bonaventure, by revising the text of his Biblical Bachelor "lectio," has amplified and trans-

---

[53] *Opera omnia* (7, 217–218); translation from Bonaventure, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, vol. 8, part 2, trans. Robert J. Karris (Saint Bonaventure: 2003), 801–802.

[54] *Comm. Luc.* (7, 224).

formed it. What is also clear is that Bonaventure, like all medieval bachelors and masters, had before him the "lectio" of a predecessor: in this case, that of Hugh of St Cher,[55] where he found and employed patristic sources, above all, the homilies on St Matthew, commonly known as the *Opus imperfectum*,[56] which at that time were attributed to St John Chrysostom. These homilies are cited fifty-seven times in the *Super Lucam*. The authorities most frequently encountered are Ambrose, with seventy citations, and St Bede the Venerable, with one hundred and sixty-four.[57]

The Postillae

The "Postilla on Ecclesiastes"[58]

Bonaventure's exegesis of Ecclesiastes takes the form of a postilla that is very close to that of Hugh of St Cher, and yet is original. It is an example of the fact that a simple commentary may become a classical work, quoted later on without any indication of its author and plundered without scruple.[59]

The technique of exposition is perfectly developed. After a prologue in which Bonaventure studies the true character of Ecclesiastes, of which he proposes different aspects through recourse to the four causes of Aristotle,[60] he goes straight to what is interesting to the medieval reader: Knowledge is a road to wisdom. The human soul is made for the eternal. "All things in this world are vanity; now vanity does not satisfy (. . .). As the wind cannot appease the stomach, nor shadows fill the things that cast them, neither can temporal things that are but shadows of the eternal appease man's

---

[55] Hugh of St Cher, *In Evangelia*, 6 (Venice: 1754), 125v–275r.

[56] See *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, 2nd ed., n. 771. These homilies were translated by the fifth-century Pelagian Deacon Annanius.

[57] St Ambrose, *Expos. Evang. sec. Lucam* (PL 15, 1527ff.); St Bede the Venerable, *In Lucae evang. expos.* (PL 92, 301ff.).

[58] *Opera omnia* (6, 3–103). The word "Postilla" refers to a rather short commentary with an assortment of questions.

[59] See Smalley, *The Study*, 274: I have seen a large number of postillae on Ecclesiastes from the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries: all quote Bonaventure, and all quote him anonymously. See Smalley, "Some Thirteenth-century Commentaries in Sapiential Books," *Dominican Studies* 2 (1949): 318–355; 3 (1950): 41–77; see, also on William of Middleton, who frequently quotes this commentary, Smalley, "William of Middleton and Guibert de Nogent," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 16 (1949): 273, n. 4, 281–283.

[60] This exposition by the four causes was inaugurated by Guerric of St Quentin, Master at Saint-Jacques from 1233 to 1242; see Smalley, *The Study*, 296–297.

desire, for he is made for the eternal."[61] This same theme recurs frequently in Bonaventure's pages.[62] The work then develops in a theological direction, and establishes the fundamental ideas that will remain the program of all of Bonaventure's teaching, as witnessed by this admirably worded text; "*Verbum divinum est omnis creatura, quia Deum loquitur*"[63]—"Every creature is the divine word, because it speaks of God."

Bonaventure takes full advantage of the wealth of the literal sense, which another commentator, Guerric, had hardly touched upon in his postilla.[64] To each chapter or group of verses he juxtaposes one or several questions, eighty-three in all. These same questions will be used, either verbatim or in a slightly modified form, by many later commentators.[65]

The *Postilla on Ecclesiastes* is a model of literal interpretation in which objects and problems are clearly defined. Its popularity shows that this form of exposition provided its audience and its readers with what they desired.[66]

The sources upon which Bonaventure has drawn seem to be the *Glossae* and St Jerome's *Commentary*. The influence of Hugh of St Victor appears in the study of vanity, which is considered under the three aspects of change, curiosity, and frailty.[67] The Quaracchi editors mention, as a further source which is possible if not probable, the *Expositio mystica in Ecclesiasten* of Solonius, bishop of Vienne (d. 453).[68]

Because he adopts the views of Hugh St Victor on vanity, Bonaventure is led to quote the works of Aristotle, including the *Libri naturales*, twenty-nine times. He does not weaken his exegesis thereby, for, as he says: "All forms of knowledge are ordained to the knowledge of Sacred Scripture, contained within it, perfected in it, and directed through it to eternal illumination."[69]

---

[61] *Comm. Ecc.*, prol., n. 7 (6, 4).

[62] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 1, a. 1, con. (5, 49); see general index, under: *aeternitas, creatio, beatitudo* and the particular indexes of vols. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

[63] *Comm. Ecc.*, 1, II, q. 2, con. (6, 16).

[64] Smalley, *The Study*, 298–414.

[65] Smalley, *The Study*, 276, 298.

[66] Smalley, *The Study*, 298.

[67] Hugh of St Victor, *In Eccl.*, homil. 1 (PL 175, 115–133).

[68] PL 53, 993ff.; see *Scholion*, 6, 99. There is no trace of either Alcuin or Ruppert.

[69] *Red. art.* (5, 321); cf. *Tri. quaes. mag.* (8, 335): "On ne peut comprendre la Sainte Ecriture si l'on ignore les autres sciences"; see Spicq, *Esquisse*, 242.

The "Postilla on the Book of Wisdom"[70]

The Quaracchi editors chose to include in their critical edition a *Commentary on the Book of Wisdom*. It is certain that Bonaventure composed such a *Commentary*. The fact is mentioned in a reliable manuscript.[71] Is this the one published in the *Opera omnia*? A detailed discussion of the problem is found in the Prolegomena to vol. 6 (1893). Nine years later, in vol. 10, the editors return to the question, but again without solving it with certainty. After admitting that the text they published may be the work of anyone of four men (three Dominicans—John of Varzy, William of Altona, Nicolas Gorran[72]—or of Bonaventure himself), they conclude that they cannot determine the true author. It seems to me, however, that there is no doubt, upon examination of this list, that this work should be attributed to John of Varzy.[73]

The "Postilla on the Gospel of Saint John"

In Bonaventure's exegetical study of the Gospel of Saint John, we find again the same technique of exposition as in the *Postilla on Ecclesiastes*. Three hundred and ninety-nine questions occur in the work, each after the "reading" of a text.

These questions are generally rather short. At times, there is nothing more than a mere explanation, like the example that follows:

> Qu. l: Here one wonders why the Lord compares himself to a door, while above he compared himself to the gatekeeper: how can he be at the same time the door, the gatekeeper, and the shepherd? I answer: As is said in ch. 14, Christ is the way and the truth and the life: the way toward the Father, and

---

[70] *Opera omnia* (6, 107–235).

[71] *Opera omnia* (6, xv). This manuscript contains a list of the books that were on sale in the stores.

[72] See *Opera omnia* (6, xviii–xxix; 10, 13).

[73] See *Opera omnia* (6, Prolegomena, xviiif.). See Jacques G. Bougerol, *Manuscrits franciscains de la Bibliothèque de Troyes* (Grottaferrata: 1982), Introduction; Balduinus Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae scripta* (Rome: 1975), n. 12, 18–19; Ignatius Brady, "The *Opera omnia* of Bonaventure Revisited," in *Proceedings of the Seventh Cententary Celebration of the Death of Saint Bonaventure*, ed. Pascal F. Foley (Saint Bonaventure: 1975), 47–59; Smalley, "Some Thirteenth-century commentaries," 41–77, 236–274; Jacques G. Bougerol, "Pecia et critique d'authenticité: Le problème du 'Super Sapientiam' attribué à S. Bonaventure," in *La production du livre universitaire au moyen âge, Exemplar et Pecia* (Paris: 1988), 205–208; Dominic Monti, "A Reconsideration of the Authorship of the Commentary on the Book of Wisdom Attributed to St Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 79 (1986): 359–391.

> hence the door; the truth teaching the way, and hence the gatekeeper; the life, and hence the shepherd who brings forth and preserves life.[74]

Bonaventure has read Augustine well, and summarizes him in striking terms.[75]

Even though the thirteen manuscripts containing the text published in the Quaracchi *Opera omnia* have the name of Bonaventure, there is extreme confusion among the manuscripts. Accordingly, we should not fall prey to the illusion that the text is certainly authentic.[76]

The "Collations on Saint John"[77]

The title given by the Quaracchi editors to this ensemble of schemas comes from a single manuscript, Toledo Cab. Caion. 17 cod. 8: "Incipiunt collationes super evangelium iohannis a fratre bonaventura generali ministro fratrum minorum edite."

With regard to the text, study is underway to elucidate the literary genre and authenticity of the schemas that make up these *Collationes*. It is indeed very difficult to establish a relationship between them and the Postillae. Everything seems different: vocabulary, thought, authorities cited. When, for example, we compare Postilla *super Ioannem*, c. 1, n. 59,[78] on the meaning of the word *medium*, and Collation 4, n. 4,[79] we realize the complete diversity of exegesis. In the Postillae, Bonaventure draws the following distinctions: "Dicitur autem Christus stare in medio, vel etiam locum medium specialiter eligere, quia medium est locus humilitatis locus communitatis (...) stabilitatis (...) proximitatis."

In Collation 4, n. 4, we read, on the contrary: "Nota quod Christus fuit medius inter hominem et Deum, inter hominem et angelum, inter hominem et hominem."

The example illustrating the mediation *inter hominem et hominem* is significant: "Medius fuit inter hominem et hominem, quia homines ad concordiam revocavit; unde legitur Lucae vigesimo tertio, quod cum eum

---

[74] *Super Ioannem*, c. 10, v. 7, q. 1, resp. (6, 386).
[75] Augustine, *In. Io. Evang*., n. 46, n. 4 (PL 35, 1729).
[76] MS Milano, Ambros. A 11 sup., fol. 80r–v: Ecce intelliget servus meus etc.
[77] *Opera omnia* (6, 535–634).
[78] *Opera omnia* (6, 59).
[79] *Opera omnia* (6, 541).

misiesset Pilatus ad Herodem, facti sunt amici Pilatus et Herodes in illa die; nam antea inimici erant ad invicem."

This means that the authenticity of St Bonaventure's *Collationes super Ioannem* must now be seen as problematic.[80]

[80] See L.J. Bataillon, "De la lectio à la predicatio: Commentaires bibliques et sermons au XIII^{e} siècle," *Revue de Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 70 (1986): 564–568. Certainly, among others, Annotatio 79 (6, 631–632) forms the first part of a sermon of St. Peter Saint-Benoît: "Videbit omnis caro salutare Dei" (Schneyer, n. 14), the second part of which is Collatio 39 (6, 628–631).

BONAVENTURE'S TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY

Zachary Hayes[1]

Historical Orientation
The Trinitarian Perspectives of St Augustine and Richard of St Victor

The great theologians of the patristic and scholastic ages saw the mystery of the Trinity as foundational to the Christian faith. It seemed impossible to say what Christians felt obliged to affirm concerning the person and destiny of Jesus Christ without in some way expanding the concept of God mediated by the Old Testament in Ex. 3:14. Nor was it possible to accept at face-value the Platonic or the Aristotelian versions of metaphysics, for both seemed incapable of providing an adequate framework in which to express and speculate on the matter of God's self-communication to the world for the world's salvation in the person of Jesus Christ. The Trinitarian dogma has emerged in the Christian world as a function of Christology, dealing first with the theological understanding of the Word and later with the question of the Holy Spirit. Moving from the basis of the dogma, theological reflection has—over the centuries—developed a form of metaphysical reflection on the nature of the first principle of reality which differs profoundly from anything which the heritage of Greek philosophy could offer. In its full flowering in the scholastic period, Trinitarian thought was not only a religious dogma but a highly developed metaphysical doctrine which held pride of place in the great theologians of the thirteenth century.

There are two figures in the history of Western thought who must be considered in approaching the Trinitarian style of Bonaventure, namely, Augustine and Richard of St Victor. Already in the fifth century, Augustine had seen his task to lie in the pursuit of a deeper understanding of faith. As worked out in reference to the dogma of the Trinity, this program

---

[1] This essay is reproduced in part with permission from Franciscan Institute Publications. It originally appeared as Zachary Hayes, *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity* (Works of Saint Bonaventure) 3 (Saint Bonaventure: 2000). The essay has been edited with updated bibliographic annotation by Jay M. Hammond and Jared Goff.

would clearly reflect philosophical structures of a Neo-Platonic inspiration as well as a profoundly moving psychological analysis of the experiences of the human spirit.[2]

It was clear to the bishop of Hippo that scripture required faith in the Trinity. While earlier theologians had sought to shed light on the dogma by making use of analogies drawn from the realm of physical nature, Augustine sensed that the inadequacy of such images was all too obvious. He was familiar also with certain emanationist forms of Neo-Platonism, forms which assumed, at times, triadic structures, as in the case of Plotinus.[3] But none of these, as they stood, was adequate to carry out what Augustine felt was necessary.

"Unless you believe, you will not understand."[4] Faith can enlighten and purify reason. One must love God and desire him in order to enter more deeply into some understanding of that which one loves. Such a view could help the theologian grow in understanding, while avoiding the excesses of rationalism which Augustine saw in Sabellianism and Arianism. In his own attempts to develop Trinitarian speculation, Augustine would employ the philosophical tools available to him so as to move beyond the limitations of the earlier physical analogies and to develop a more apt understanding of relation, thereby making it possible to conceive of one God in three Persons without introducing division or inequality into the Godhead.

The broader lines of Augustine's notion of the human person as an image of God are deeply rooted in Plotinian emanationism. That which is said to emanate is the image of that from which it flows. An image, therefore, is that which flows from another; but its existence as an image is brought to its fullness in as far as it turns back to its source. It is precisely in the turning back to its source that it is constituted as an image in the full sense. The image can then project itself into yet another as its image; and thus a series of emanations arises.[5] Augustine's general understanding

---

[2] Michael Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus*. (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie) 11 (1927; repr. Münster: 1967), 1–10, and the "Nachwort," iii–xxi; Alfred Schindler, *Wort und Analogie in Augustins Trinitätslehre*. (Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie) 4 (Tübingen: 1965), 196–228.

[3] John M. Rist, *Plotinus, The Road to Reality* (1967; repr. Cambridge: 1977), 21–52, 66–83; Johannes Hirschberger, *Geschichte der Philosophie. Altertum und Mittelalter*, vol. 1 (Freiburg: 1961), 303–307; Ignatius Brady, *A History of Ancient Philosophy* (Milwaukee: 1959), 180–186; Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, vol. 1/2 (London: 1946), 463–475.

[4] Is. 7:9. This text in the Old Latin version inspired Christians early in Western history to the program of faith seeking understanding.

[5] John E. Sullivan, *The Image of God. The Doctrine of St. Augustine and Its Influence* (Dubuque: 1963), 3–25; Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre*, 195–200.

of the created world reflects this emanationist structure, though in a corrected form. He recognizes in the world a hierarchy of participations, of weaker and stronger resemblances. To exist as an image of God means, for Augustine, to exist in the tension between the going-forth and the return, and thus to be characterized by a deep and abiding tendency of the soul to God, who is always present to the soul as both source and goal.

If the human person is constituted as an image of God, it should be possible—by probing into the deep recesses of human experience—to derive some clues as to the nature of the ultimate source and goal of the image. Thus, the latter books of the *De trinitate* (bks. 9–15) are devoted to the elaboration of triadic structures in the human person which provide more adequate analogies for speaking of the triune nature of God. The triads *mens-notitia-amor* and *memoria-intelligentia-voluntas* were to have a profound effect on centuries of Trinitarian speculation in the West, lending it a strongly psychological tone.

This understanding of the human person as an image of God, together with the development of the doctrine of relation, set the stage for centuries of theological work. Yet it was not the only style of trinitarian thought to develop in the West, for out of the Victorine school of the twelfth century was to come an approach which differed markedly from that of Augustine. The difference is all the more significant in view of the fact that the Victorines clearly knew the work of Augustine.[6] Yet, the influence of the great African was not so great as to obliterate other possibilities. It is above all in Richard of St Victor that we discern a new and original style of Trinitarian reflection. While aware of the heritage of Augustine, Richard's primary orientation seems to be not through the analysis of human cognitional experience, but through an analysis of the nature of love.[7] He thus chose an element which was marginal in Augustine and placed it in the center of his own thought.

---

[6] Hugh of St Victor, *Summa Sententiarum*, tr. I, c. 6 (PL 176, 51) and *De Sacramentis* I, 3, c. 20 (PL 176, 225); c. 21 (PL 176, 225); c. 25 (PL 176, 227); c. 26 (PL 176, 227–228) clearly indicate an awareness of the Augustinian heritage.

[7] Wilhelm Gössman, "Die Methode der Trinitätslehre in der Summa Halensis," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 6 (1955): 256: "Der methodische Neuansatz Richards von St. Viktor ist der Grund, weshalb im Mittelalter die Trinitätslehre unter Beibehaltung der dogmatischen Definitionen aus der Väterzeit eine eigenständige Fruchtbarkeit erreicht hat." Gössman argues that the major difference between Augustine and Richard lies in the fact that the former takes his primary analogies from the individual human soul, whereas the latter draws his from the love relation between several human persons (256–257).

After showing through an analysis of certain attributes of God that there can be but one God from whom all creatures proceed,[8] Richard states that the God who is *substantialiter unus*[9] is the highest good and consequently is goodness itself.[10] The first two books lead to the conclusion that God is the fullness and perfection of all goodness. But of all things that are good, nothing is better or more perfect than charity.[11] Charity is the supreme content of the good. Thus two important themes are brought into conjunction: the concept of God as perfect goodness, and the New Testament concept of altruistic love which is seen as the highest form of goodness. The line of Richard's development begins to emerge clearly. However we approach the mystery of God, he is to be seen as the fullness of all perfections. But "where the fullness of divinity is found, there is the fullness of goodness, and consequently, there is likewise the fullness of charity."[12]

Charity, which is the supreme form of the good, becomes the basis for showing the necessity of a plurality of persons in the Godhead. Since charity necessarily involves a relation to another,[13] there can be no charity where there is no plurality. Charity must be in proportion to the good that is loved. A creature, as a limited good, cannot be the object of the highest love of God; for such love would be inordinate and would conflict with divine wisdom. Since God alone is supreme goodness, he alone is supremely lovable. Hence, God cannot show supreme love to anyone who lacks divinity. The fullness of divinity cannot exist without the fullness of goodness. And the fullness of goodness cannot exist without the fullness of charity; nor can the fullness of charity exist in God without some sort of plurality in God himself; for the supreme charity which must be found in God must be directed to God himself if it is not to be inordinate.[14] Hence, it is the nature of charity, which is the highest form of the good, that necessarily requires a plurality in God; and this plurality Richard locates at the level of person.

A further analysis of the communication of love leads to the conclusion that such a communication must involve no less than three persons.

---

[8] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 1.4–2.8, ed. Jean Ribaillier (Paris: 1958), 98–115.

[9] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 1.16 (99–100).

[10] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 2.16 (123).

[11] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 3.2 (136–137).

[12] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 5.7 (202–203). Richard bases his view on a well-known passage of Gregory the Great, *In Evangelia Hom.* 17 (PL 76, 1139).

[13] Richard of St. Victor, *De Trinitate* 3.2 (136–137). *Oportet itaque ut amor in alterum tendat, ut charitas esse queat.*

[14] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 3.2 (136–137).

If there were only one Person in God, then a perfect self-communication would not be possible at all; for no creature could sustain such a communication. So, there must be at least two Persons of love. For if love by nature involves a relation to another, the highest perfection of love demands that each of the two persons in love share that love with yet another. Hence, Richard argues that there must be in God not only a *dilectum* but a *condilectum* as well.[15] *Condilectio* is found where a third is loved by two in harmony.[16]

This style of reflection leads to an understanding of God in terms of modalities of love. There are three such modalities in God: *amor gratuitus, amor debitus*, and *amor ex utroque permixtus*, which describe the three Persons of the Trinity.[17] The first is found in the Father in as far as he is love who freely gives without having received. The third is found in the Holy Spirit in as far as he returns love to those from whom he has received the free gift of love. The second corresponds to the Son who both receives the free gift of the Father's love and, together with the Father, confers the gift of free love on the Spirit. Chs. 17–19 of the fifth book make an extended application of this analysis of the modalities of love, and ch. 20 makes use of the analysis to show why a fourth Person is impossible.

Here the groundwork is laid for a style quite different from the Augustinian psychological theory; yet it also may be seen as rooted in an analysis of psychological experience, though it seems to be located above all in those areas which we would designate as interpersonal and moral. It is a theology which would never achieve a position of equal influence, but which would play a significant role in the thought of the early Franciscan school and to some degree in the work of St Bonaventure, though the elements which the Seraphic Doctor employs are transformed into a framework which draws its inspiration from quite different sources.

In the late nineteenth century, De Regnon produced a study of the history of Trinitarian thought[18] which argued eloquently for the presence of different traditions in Western Trinitarianism, pointing out the existence of fundamental differences between Aquinas and Bonaventure, and tracing Bonaventure's roots through the *Summa fratris Alexandri* proximately to Richard of St Victor and remotely to Pseudo-Dionysius. By way of contrast,

---

[15] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 2.14 (149–150).
[16] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 3.19 (153–154).
[17] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 5.16 (214–215).
[18] Théodore De Regnon, *Etudes de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité*, 3 vols. (Paris: 1892–1898).

the lineage of Aquinas was seen to be rooted in Augustine. The two major lines of development which De Regnon traces are: 1) Dionysius—Richard of St Victor—William of Auvergne—William of Auxerre—Alexander—Bonaventure; and 2) Augustine—Anselm—Lombard—Albert—Aquinas. The fundamental differences between the two he traces to the dynamism of Neo-Platonic thought in the first line and the static character of Aristotelian thought in the second.[19]

De Regnon's thesis was to set the tone for many studies of medieval thought, influencing even the Quaracchi editors of the *Summa fratris Alexandri*. Stohr's extended study of Bonaventure[20] focuses primarily on the historical sources and the scientific dimensions of Bonaventure's work. While criticizing many particular points of De Regnon's study, Stohr accepts the main line of the argument and interprets Bonaventure accordingly. Despite the extensive influence of Augustine elsewhere in Bonaventure's writings—so writes Stohr—hardly a trace of the African's influence can be found at the roots of Bonaventure's Trinitarian theology, while the influence of Richard and Pseudo-Dionysius is everywhere apparent.[21] Stohr agrees with De Regnon's assessment of the Dionysian character of Richard's thought,[22] but he differs in his understanding of the *Summa* both as regards its own theology and as regards its influence on Bonaventure.

Standing within the same basic framework are the studies of Schmaus, Imle-Kaup, Villalmonte, and Szabo.[23] With minor variations, the basic argument of De Regnon lived on and influenced subsequent historical studies to a significant degree. Of fundamental importance in this thesis is the question of the sources of Bonaventure's theology, particularly Richard of St Victor and Alexander of Hales, for the way in which one under-

---

[19] De Regnon, *Etudes de théologie*, vol. 2, 448ff.

[20] Albert Stohr, *Die Trinitätslehre des hl. Bonaventura: Eine systematische Darstellung und historische Würdigung. I Teil, Die wissenschaftliche Trinitätslehre* (Münster: 1923).

[21] Stohr, *Trinitatslehre*, 34.

[22] Stohr, *Trinitatslehre*, p. 78. Stohr speaks with approval of De Regnon's analysis of two theories in Richard; the first, a metaphysical theory of the good; the second, a psychological theory of love.

[23] Michael Schmaus, *Der Liber Propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus und die Lehrunterschiede zwischen Thomas von Aquin and Duns Scotus. II Teil, Die Trinitarischen Lehrdifferenzen* (Münster: 1930); Fanny Imle and Julien Kaup, *Die Theologie des hl. Bonaventura. Darstellung seiner dogmatischen Lehren* (Werl: 1931); Alejandro de Villalmonte, "Influjo de los Padres griegos en la doctrina trinitaria de San Buenaventura," in *XIII Semana Española de Teología, 14–19 September 1953* (Madrid: 1954), 553–557; Titus Szabo, *De ss. Trinitate in Creaturis Refulgente Doctrina S. Bonaventurae* (Rome: 1959).

stands these two in relation to Bonaventure as well as in the inspiration of their own thought will significantly influence one's historical assessment of Bonaventure.

In a subsequent study, Olegario Gonzalez[24] takes up the question in a fresh way in the light of new materials concerning Richard of St Victor.[25] So significantly have the results of studies in that area changed the terrain that Gonzalez does not hesitate to speak of a "Copernican revolution."[26] The earlier position tended to present Richard as a deserter from the camp of Augustine who drank deeply from Greek streams and thus developed a style that was truly competitive to the Augustinian tradition. More recent studies have shown Richard to be far more Latin than would have been allowed in the older interpretation.[27] Recognizing the importance of the concept of love in the Victorine's work, Gonzalez writes: "Lo que in Ricardo es una intuition explicativa de toda la obra, es una nota marginal en Agustin."[28] While earlier studies placed great weight on the Dionysian influence in Richard, later studies indicate two significant facts which oppose that view: 1) the concept of the good in Richard finds a more likely explanation in Anselm's "being than which no greater can be conceived";[29] and 2) the dominant idea in Richard's thought is not the idea of the good, but the psychological analysis of love.[30] Dumeige concludes that there is

---

[24] Olegario Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario y existencia humana: estudio historico teologico en torno a san Buenaventura* (Madrid: 1966).

[25] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate. Texte critique avec introduction, notes et tables*, ed. Jean Ribaillier (Textes philosophiques du Moyen Âge) 6 (Paris: 1959); G. Salet, *La Trinité. Text Latin, introduction, traduction et notes de G. Salet* (Sources Chrétiennes) 63 (Paris: 1959); Gervais Dumeige, *Richard de Saint Victor et l'idée chrétienne de l'amour* (Paris: 1952).

[26] Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 337: "tenemos que confesar que la investigatión de los últimos quince años ha realizado un giro copernicano."

[27] Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 337–338: "Ricardo es uno puro latino, un agustiniano, que su teologiá ha surgido bajo la fascinatión de Agustin; y que, si no exclusivamente, sí fundamentalmente es agustiniano."

[28] Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 338. Also, Ribaillier, *De Trinitate*, 136–137, suggests an Augustinian inspiration for the notion of *caritas ordinata*, which plays a significant role in Richard's argument. See Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, 1.27 (CCLS) 32, 21–22).

[29] Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 345. One need simply add to the Anselmian concept the idea that goodness is a perfection which must therefore be found in such a being. In his critical edition of the Victorine text, Ribaillier (*De Trinitate*, 123–126) suggests only Latin sources, including Anselm and Boethius, as the inspiration for Richard's chapters on the good (3.16–19). See also Ribaillier, *De Trinitate*, 18–19, on patristic sources represented in Richard's *De Trinitate*. Ribaillier indicates that the definition of charity is inspired by Gregory the Great, while the concept of ordered love is drawn from Augustine, and the notion of beatitude is inspired by Boethius. See also Salet, *La Trinité*, 10–13.

[30] The structure of Richard's argument appears clearly in *De Trinitate* 3.2 (136–137). A comparison with Bonaventure's *Itinerarium* 6.1–2 (5, 310–311) shows a dramatic contrast

scarcely a trace of the Dionysian concept in the whole of Richard's work on the Trinity.[31]

This is not to deny that there is a Neo-Platonic influence in Richard. Ribaillier sees such an influence reflected in Richard's frequent use of ternary groups, the over-all double movement of his dialectic, and in the concept of harmonious beauty.[32] Yet at the core of the Victorine argument for a plurality of divine Persons lies not the Dionysian concept of the good, but the analysis of charity. Nor does this deny the existence of an alternative system of Trinitarian theology in the Middle Ages contrasting with that developed by Aquinas out of largely Augustinian sources. But if there is such an alternate Trinitarianism living largely from Dionysian Neo-Platonism, this would not be traced to Richard, as has been done repeatedly. While his Trinitarian thought is different from that of Augustine, the difference does not lie in the fact that one is Latin and the other Greek; for it seems that Richard's Trinitarian thought can be accounted for on the basis of Latin sources, including Augustine himself.

This shift in Victorine studies unavoidably raises many new questions about Bonaventure, for it has long been assumed that he was deeply influenced by Richard, and that he imbibed a Dionysian inspiration from the great Victorine. If such an inspiration is lacking in Richard, it is—nonetheless—present in Bonaventure. But from what sources is it derived? And what is the precise nature of the tie between Richard and Bonaventure, if the latter is fundamentally Dionysian while the former is not? These questions raise the further question of Alexander of Hales in relation both to Richard and Dionysius on the one hand, and to Bonaventure on the other.

In view of the still unresolved question of the *Summa fratris Alexandri*, it is necessary to distinguish between the *Summa*, which is a compilation,[33]

---

at least between these two works. To what extent the *Itinerarium* is characteristic of Bonaventure's work as a whole will be examined later. It is, indeed, the concept of charity which plays the decisive role in Richard's view, not a supposedly Dionysian metaphysic of the good. See also Salet, *La Trinité*, 477–480.

[31] *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, "Denys," col. 327: "Son grand ouvrage sur la Trinité ne porte pas trace des conceptions dionysiennes." Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 363, also concludes that while Richard is an original thinker, the source of his thought is not Greek but Latin; Dionysius has no influence on his Trinitarian speculation, nor was Plotinus known to him. If one is to speak of a Greek-Dionysian movement, it must be placed after Richard.

[32] Ribaillier, *De Trinitate*, 24–27.

[33] *Summa Theologica*, vol. 4 (Quaracchi: 1948), section 2, lix–lxxxi; Victorin Doucet, "A New Source of the '*Summa Fratris Alexandri*'," *Franciscan Studies* 6 (1946): 403–417;

and those works which may be ascribed to Alexander with certainty, such as the *Quaestiones disputatae* and the *Glossa* on the *Sentences* of Lombard.[34] The Trinitarian doctrine of the *Quaestiones* reveals abundant references to Augustine's *De trinitate.* While citations of Richard of St Victor are scarce,[35] his definition of person is known. Citations of Pseudo-Dionysius are frequent. While the texts cited reveal knowledge of the concepts of fontality, fecundity, and goodness, the ideas are not developed as they will be later by Bonaventure.

In contrast with the *Quaestiones*, the *Glossa* in its treatment of the same matters cites Richard with great frequency. Among the texts quoted are those which are especially characteristic of Richard,[36] and which will play a very important role in Bonaventure. We find also significant citations of Pseudo-Dionysius on the nature of God as the supreme good, as well as a Dionysian description of love as a circle: *Amor ostenditur sicut quidam aeternus circulus, per optimum, ex optimo, in optimo et in optimum.*"[37] Such language will be found later in Bonaventure, where it will express a view that has become fully personalized by the Seraphic Doctor. Thus, in his certainly authentic writings, Alexander both knows and uses Pseudo-Dionysius and Richard of St Victor, though the characteristic insights of neither are developed to a significant extent.

While the *Summa* in its entirety is not the personal work of Alexander, he is certainly a major influence behind the work of the compilers. The *Summa* manifests Aristotelian, Platonic, Dionysian, Augustinian, and Victorine influences. The only Greek sources to which it refers are

---

Victorin Doucet, "The History of the Problem of the Authenticity of the Summa," *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947): 26–41, 274–312, and especially Doucet's carefully worded conclusions (310–312). To a great extent, the first three books were compiled before Alexander's death. These books are clearly compilations which draw on the writings of John of Rupella and Alexander among others. As to the more precise clarification of the origin of these books, the problem has yet to be solved. The first three books reflect a strong influence of Alexander. which may by clarified by the fact that he was one of the compilers, and that his works were an important source and were used extensively.

[34] *Quaestiones Disputatae 'antequam esset Frater.'* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi) 19–21 (Quaracchi: 1960); *Glossa super IV Libros Sententiarum* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi) 12–15 (Quaracchi: 1952–1957).

[35] Of the few references to Richard's work, two are mistakenly attributed to Augustine and one to Hugh of St Victor.

[36] *Glossa*, I, d. 3 (74) cites a text which gives the characteristic argument of Richard for the plurality of persons in God. The argument moves from the fullest goodness to the fullest charity to the plurality of persons. See Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate*, 3.2 (136–137). Also d. 18 (182) cites Richard on the three modes of love (153); d. 19 cites the argument for supreme charity in God from the highest felicity (153–154).

[37] *Glossa*, I, d. 17 (173).

Pseudo-Dionysius and John Damascene.[38] Two factors which will later assume the most fundamental role in Bonaventure's development of Trinitarian theology stand out as significant already in the *Summa*: 1) the predominant role of the Dionysian concept of *bonum diffusivum sui* in arguing for the existence of the Trinity; and 2) the Aristotelian principle affirming two perfect modes of procession, i.e. by nature and by will.[39] The Dionysian concept of the self-diffusive good plays a leading role, though it is joined with elements drawn from Anselm and Richard.[40] Together with John Damascene, Pseudo-Dionysius is the most frequently cited source, and in this regard the *Summa* seems to go beyond Alexander's authentic writings.

We may, therefore, conclude that Bonaventure became familiar with both Pseudo-Dionysius and Richard through Alexander as well as through the developments in the early school of the friars after the death of Alexander in 1245. To what degree Bonaventure's contact with these two sources may have been the ordinary contact which would have been a self-evident part of his education at Paris at that time remains unclear. As we will see, the Dionysian tradition will assume a unique importance in Bonaventure's Trinitarian thought, and the Victorine insights will be exploited in a distinctively personal way. Despite the obvious historical and literary relations between Bonaventure and the *Summa*, it is indisputable that the Seraphic Doctor's Trinitarian theology transcends that of the *Summa* in unity and coherence of thought. It clearly bears the mark of a single, keen mind that has appropriated the tradition in a personal way.

---

[38] De Regnon's statement (*Etudes de théologie*, 2, 355) that the *Summa* appealed to all the Greek Fathers appears as an exaggeration in the light of this. See also *Summa Theologica* 4, sect. 2, § 2, cap. 1 (5, lxxxix).

[39] *Summa Theologica* 1, prol., sect. II, § 1 (xviii–xxxv; see Wilhem Gössmann, "Die Methode der Trinitätslehre," 253–262). The *Summa* makes use of the Dionysian concept of the self-diffusive good to derive the persons in the Trinity and to explain the incarnation, but it is used only in a modified sense in the area of creation theology, probably because of the danger of pantheism (255–256). See also. Wilhelm Gössmann, *Metaphysik und Heilsgeschichte. Eine theologische Untersuchung der Summa Halensis* (Munich: 1964), 363–370.

[40] Dionysian, Anselmian, and Victorine overtones are present in the *Summa*'s description of the highest diffusion: *Summa autem diffusio est qua maior excogitari non potest; maior autem diffusio cogitari non potest quam illa quae est secundum substantiam et maxime secundum totam; ergo summum bonum necessario se diffundit secundum substantiam totam* (*Summa Theologica* 1, n. 295 [414]). Although Richard is cited several times in this question, no reference is made to his concept of charity in explaining the generation of the Son.

Bonaventure expresses his respect for Alexander explicitly on several occasions[41] and his intention of following the opinions of the early school.[42] His references to Alexander are best seen as pointing to Alexander himself rather than to the *Summa*, though Bonaventure's writings frequently show entire sections that parallel the *Summa* at times only in general structure, but at other times even down to particular arguments. The Dionysian concept of the good, already present in Alexander[43] and in the *Summa*,[44] becomes dominant in a very personal way in Bonaventure; thus his Trinitarian thought is deeply conditioned by the Areopagite, certainly through indirect contact, and possibly by direct contact as well.[45]

The *Summa* already had transformed Victorine materials in the light of the metaphysics of the good. Even more so is this the case with Bonaventure, whose fundamental arguments for the Trinity are clearly different from those of Richard. Yet, there are many ties with Richard that become apparent especially in Bonaventure's terminology. While for Richard the principal argument for the plurality of Persons is drawn from the analysis of love, in the theology of Bonaventure the same argument is integrated into a metaphysics based expressly on the concept of the good. Thus, the terminology itself, though it sounds Victorine, frequently takes on a new

---

[41] *Prael. ad II Sent.* (II, 1); *II Sent.*, d. 23, a. 2, q. 3, ad 7 (II, 547); *Tri. Quaes. mag* n. 11 (8, 335).

[42] *Hex.* 11, 4 (5, 381).

[43] *Glossa*, I, d. 3, p. 71; d. 8 (100).

[44] See *Summa Theologica* 1, prol., sec. II, § 2 (xxxv–xxxviii). "Etenim Alexander a schola S. Victoris repetit principium fundamentale, non solum suarum inquisitionum circa mysterium SS. Trinitatis, ut iam recte observaverat cl. de Régnon, S.I., sed etiam totius sui systematis generalis, scilicet conceptionem extaticam summi boni sive amoris." Also, *Summa* I, n. 64, ad 4 (96) and ad 5 (96). The idea of the good is basic in the derivation of the plurality of Persons. The good is to be understood not only in the absolute sense, but also in as far as it is in the Person of the Father, who is *principium totius divinitatis* (n. 297, ad 10 [427]; and ad 23 [429]). The argument from *caritas* is also in the *Summa.* Perfect charity tends to another because "nunquam potest esse solitaria" (n. 324, ad 4 [440]). The communication of the good can take place in only two ways: *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis* (n. 319, sol. [469]).

[45] Both the *Summa* and Bonaventure cite the translation of John Sarracenus, whose work, together with that of Thomas of Vercelli, opened Western theology to the influence of the Areopagite. To trace the influence of Dionysius on Bonaventure would require a separate study. On the one hand, there seem to be no cogent textual reasons to assume an influence beyond that which would have normally been expected in the schools of that time. On the other hand, the fact that a number of crucial Dionysian concepts assume an exceptional importance as early as the *Sentence Commentary* suggests that it must remain an open question whether Bonaventure may have had a close personal acquaintance with the works of the Areopagite. See Joseph Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes (Chicago: 1971), 86–94.

meaning as it is conditioned by the dynamics of fecundity, which played no role in Richard.[46]

In attempting to assess Bonaventure's work in relation to its sources, Gonzalez concludes that there is indeed a style of Trinitarian thought in the thirteenth century that differs fundamentally from that of Thomas; its creator and systematizer, however, is not Richard but Bonaventure.[47] Its fundamental inspiration is to be sought in the religious experience of St Francis and in philosophical elements drawn from Pseudo-Dionysius and Aristotle as these had been transmitted to Bonaventure by Alexander and by the developments of the early school of friars at Paris. Other elements, including the Augustinian and the Victorine Trinitarian traditions, are transformed within the framework which was built upon these primary sources. Thus Bonaventure's Trinitarian view of reality, while it draws from many and disparate sources, appears as a highly personal synthesis. In this sense, we can continue to speak of two styles, as De Regnon had argued, but our understanding of the author and the sources of the one has been drastically revised.

The Major Trinitarian Works of Bonaventure

While the Trinity informs virtually all of Bonaventure's writings in various degrees, he explicitly considers the Trinity in five works.[48]

In his *Sentence Commentary* (1250–54), Bonaventure treats scientifically the major questions of both the metaphysical and logical orders. His doctrine on the divine processions, relations, Persons, properties, notions, appropriations, as well as the subjects of logic and language, are all found in the *Sentence Commentary* as the most comprehensive treatment he was ever to provide. Bonaventure's Trinitarian considerations within

---

[46] Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 363. Gonzalez sees Richard's influence on Bonaventure as minimal in the basic Trinitarian arguments, although Bonaventure does share Richard's confidence in reason.

[47] Gonzalez, *Misterio Trinitario*, 363: "El creador-sistematizador de la doctrina trinitaria, que correrá paralela a la tomista repartiéndose el siglo XIII, no es Ricardo, sine San Buenaventura."

[48] For questions of chronology, see the essay by Marianne Schlosser in this volume. Also see Jacques Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. Jose de Vinck (Paterson: 1963), 171–182; John F. Quinn, "Chronology of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 32 (1972): 168–186; and Jay M. Hammond, "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 179–226.

later works are all clearly shaped by his earlier treatment found in the *Commentary*.

The *Disputed Questions on the Trinity* (c. 1255) is found in the context of a rich body of literature treating similar theological concerns.[49] As the title indicates, the work follows the form of the scholastic disputation,[50] which signals that Bonaventure delivered them after becoming a Regent Master in April 1254, because only a *magister* could conduct a disputation. Hence, the *Disputed Questions* argues that the dialectic of faith and reason both find fruition in *primitas*.[51] Thus in conducting this disputation, Bonaventure finds it possible to encounter God in every category of being, not only as God but as Trinity also.[52]

Written after both the *Sentence Commentary* and the *Disputed Questions*, the *Breviloquium* may be dated about 1257, which would place it at the end of Bonaventure's university career or at the beginning of his work as minister general. Conceived as a sort of summary for students of theology, it is a most valuable source for Bonaventure's own synthesis. While some development beyond the *Sentence Commentary* may be noted in the treatment of Christology, the presentation of Trinitarian materials seems to be but a concise statement of major positions worked out in the *Commentary*, here presented in almost skeletal form and devoid of all arguments. Yet the concern over the relationship between faith and reason again shapes the text's structure.

The *Itinerarium*, which dates from Fall 1259, is a work written without the pressure of the demands and expectations of the university discipline.

---

[49] Both internal and external evidence confirms the text to be an authentic work of Bonaventure (5, vi). Nevertheless, the state of the manuscript tradition indicates that the latter part of the work, beginning with the middle of the response of qu. 6, art. 2, is found in only one manuscript. This might legitimately raise the question as to whether the work was left unfinished by Bonaventure and completed from notes by someone else. If this is the case, the question then arises as to what might have lead Bonaventure to break off his work at this point. Could it have been his appointment as general of the order? If so, this would allow for a likely dating from late 1255 to early 1257, since Bonaventure's appointment occurred in February of 1257. The question cannot be decided definitely without more work on the chronology of Bonaventure during this period of his life.

[50] Of the two types of scholastic disputes, the ordinary and the quodlibetal, these conform more closely to the former. Quodlibetal questions reflect a more wide-ranging style, while the ordinary questions are restricted in scope. Bonaventure has left no questions in the quodlibetal form.

[51] The essay further explores the seminal notion of *primitas* within Bonaveture's Trinitarian thought.

[52] Salet, *La Trinité*, 465–467; Ribaillier, *De Trinitate*, 89; Alejandro de Villalmonte, "El argumento de 'razones necessarias' en San Buenaventura," in *Estudios Franciscanos* (1952): 5–44.

It is written in a more personal style and reveals with greater clarity the characteristic concerns of the Seraphic Doctor, who was already general of the order at the time he wrote this remarkable text. It becomes immediately clear to what extent Trinitarianism pervades Bonaventure's entire vision of reality.[53] The sixth chapter provides a specifically Trinitarian reflection in which we see to what extent Bonaventure's thought was influenced by the Dionysian concept of the good. Traditional materials stemming from Augustine are transformed under the power of that concept, while materials from Richard of St Victor will provide a complementary line of argument as needed to fill out some of the inadequacies of the Neo-Platonic tradition. Thus, this work, brief as it is, and rich with insights into the work of Bonaventure as a whole, is equally significant for what it reveals of his Trinitarian style and its relation to his predecessors.

Nowhere is the Trinitarian vision of reality more persistent than in the *Collations on the Hexaëmeron* (1273), the final work of Bonaventure.[54] Here more than anywhere, his thought appears in a dense and many-layered style of theology. His vision appears like a tightly drawn circle. Regardless of where one takes hold of it, it reaches out to the Trinity and Christology, to creation and man, to metaphysics and epistemology. Behind the bewildering complexity of symbolism and historical-theological speculation, one feels the presence of a mind that has a penetrating insight into the fundamental structures of reality that pervades all that is said. Woven within a text that is Trinitarian throughout are particular sections more expressly Trinitarian in tone, such as *Collations* 9 and 11.

Beyond these major works, Trinitarian motifs appear universally in Bonaventure's spiritual and mystical writings as well as in his sermons, two of which expressly reproduce the conclusions of his scientific work.[55] While the sermons and ascetical writings may be taken as an indication of the close relation between scientific theology and spirituality, they offer no fundamentally new insights into the major Trinitarian questions.

---

[53] See Jay M. Hammond, "Order in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*," in J.A. Wayne Hellman, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology* (Saint Bonaventure: 2001), 191–271.

[54] The work was left incomplete by Bonaventure's elevation to the cardinalate and his subsequent activity at the Council of Lyons.

[55] *Sermo I: De Triplici Testimonio Sanctissimae Trinitatis* (5, 535–538); *Sermo de Trinitate* (9, 351–357).

The Trinity within the Bonaventurian System

> The created world is like a book which reflects, represents, and describes the creative Trinity.[56]

One cannot read the works of Bonaventure for long without sensing that the mystery of the Trinity pervades the whole of his vision of reality. It is a fundamental structural component of his thought both in its broader vision and in its smaller units, and even conditions the choice of language and phraseology.

As a convincingly articulated wisdom-theology, Bonaventure's thought is concerned not with knowledge for its own sake, but with saving knowledge. "Now this is everlasting life, that they may know You, the only true God, and him whom You have sent, Jesus Christ."[57] To know God in a saving way is to know him as he truly is; and he most truly is in the way he has revealed himself to be in the New Testament, above all in the person of Jesus Christ. Therefore a truly saving knowledge of God is to be found at the level of Trinitarian theology. The first principle sought by philosophy is identical, in the final analysis, with the Trinitarian God of the New Testament revelation. If all finite reality emanates from the first principle, this can be understood in a fuller sense only when we perceive that the limited emanation of the created world is grounded in the prior and perfect emanations of goodness in the first principle itself.

Hence, the entire theological endeavor of Bonaventure is inspired by the contemplation of the Trinity. If the Trinity is the source of all, then it should not be surprising that it would leave its stamp upon the world. Indeed, for Bonaventure this is the case at every level. As the objectification of the Absolute Spirit, the world as a whole is a symbol of the Trinity. The world is like a book which reflects its Trinitarian author at three levels; that of the vestige, that of the image, and that of the similitude. Every creature is a vestige representing the Trinity in a distant and unclear way; but the image, found only in intellectual creatures, reflects the Trinity in a closer and more distinct way. The similitude is that most intense reflection which is found in the rational spirit that is conformed to God through grace. These three levels are like the steps of a ladder by which the human mind is designed to ascend gradually to the supreme principle,

---

[56] *Brev.* 2, 12 (5, 230).
[57] Jn. 17:3.

who is God.[58] The world emanates from the Trinitarian exemplar and reflects the Trinitarian order at various levels and degrees.

In Bonaventure's thought, the Trinity and Christology are inseparably intertwined. It is the mystery of Christ that leads us to the Trinity; and the Trinitarian concept of God is developed as a function of Christology. At one level, the whole of the Trinity is seen as the exemplar of the world, while at another level, the mystery of exemplarity is concentrated in the second Person; for the divine Word is the total expression of all that the divine love is in itself and can be in relation to the finite. The entire triune structure of God, including the procession of the Spirit, is focused in the Word in an exemplary way.[59] In as far as the Word is the expression of the entire inner-Trinitarian life of God, that which is created as an expression of God bears a relation not only to the Trinity as such, but to the Word in particular.

The human person, created as an image of God, reflects its creative source in two ways. The spiritual soul reflects the one spiritual nature of God, while the spiritual powers of memory, intelligence, and will reflect the mystery of source, origin, and order characteristic of the Trinitarian life of God. There is here a limited reflection of the unity and Trinity of God. That which Bonaventure designates as an image of God is, in a sense, an open possibility which must be brought to actualization. By reflecting either on itself or on things above itself, the image becomes an express image. The fullest historical realization of this is found in the gift of grace whereby the human person is transformed to true God-likeness and the soul becomes a similitude of the Trinity. The world of created reality which comes forth from a Trinitarian source is here approaching its God-appointed end in the mystery of grace which finds its completion in glory, where the most perfect conformity between the created Trinity and the creative Trinity is realized. Again, the mystery of the Trinity is intertwined with the mystery of Christ. Created as the finite image of God, the human person is given the task of shaping human life personally in the likeness of the perfect Image, and thus of moving from image to similitude. To the degree that this is accomplished, the human person is personally moulded

---

[58] *Brev.* 2, 12 (5, 230). For an excellent study of Bonaventure's theology of creation, see Margot Wiegels, *Die Logik der Spontaneität. Zum Gedanken der Schöpfung bei Bonaventura* (Freiburg: 1969). Also see, Luc Mathieu, *La Trinité créatrice d'après saint Bonaventure* (Paris: 1992); J.A. Wayne Hellmann and Jay M. Hammond, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology* (Saint Bonaventure: 2001).

[59] *Hex.* 3, 7 (5, 344); *Hex.* 9, 2 (5, 373).

into the mystery of the Image who is the Son, and thus enters into the Son's relation to the Father and the Spirit. By becoming Christ-like, the human person is conformed to the Trinity.

It is clear that Bonaventure's theology is Trinitarian in a way that is profoundly different from that of his contemporary, Aquinas. Bonaventure's is a view that may be seen as a consistent economic Trinitarianism for which the world and its history is a vast symbol of the Trinitarian God who communicates Himself in being, in grace, and in consummation.

The Point of Departure

> No one is good but only God.[60]

While it is clear that Bonaventure never gives an extended treatment of the nature of God independently of the doctrine of the Trinity,[61] it would be deceptive to say that he begins his Trinitarian theology from a consideration of the individual Persons as such. The problem from which he begins in each of his major treatments is the problem of how we are to conceive of the movement from the unique and unified nature of God to the existence of three Persons.

The early Franciscan school appears to have been deeply concerned with the theological implications of the religious experience of St Francis who, because of his experience of Christ, came to emphasize the nature of God as a good and loving Father. The *summa* of the early friars gives considerable emphasis to God under this image and makes extensive use of the Dionysian metaphysics of the self-diffusive good to elaborate this religious experience at the theological level. Through the influence of Alexander of Hales and other early friar theologians, this was to become a significant factor in Bonaventure's personal synthesis.

---

[60] Lk. 18:19.

[61] In none of his works is there a tract corresponding to the familiar *De Deo Uno*. The *Sentence Commentary*, after one brief question on the unity of God, proceeds directly to the question of the plurality of Persons (*I Sent*. d. 2, au., q.1–2 [1, 51–53]). The *Breviloquium* follows the same pattern (*Brev*. 1, 2 [5, 210]). We look elsewhere in vain for such a treatment. Even the dialectic of the *Disputed Questions on the Trinity* always treats both together as articles within a question, with the dialectic finding resolution in *primitas*, the only question lacking two articles. Hence, Bonaventure always considers the attributes of the divine nature within the framework of the Trinitarian question. For a contrary opinion, see Gregory LaNave, "Bonaventure's Arguments for the Existence of God and an 'Independent' *De Deo Uno*," *The Thomist* 74 (2010): 57–84.

The emphasis on the nature of God as primal goodness is seen by Bonaventure to correspond to the New Testament revelation of the divine name: "No one is good but only God."[62] As *being* seems to be the proper name of God in the Old Testament and corresponds to the concerns of philosophy, *goodness* is the proper name of God in the New Testament and will lead eventually to Trinitarian theology.[63] Thus a clear point of contact can be seen between the religious experience of Francis and the writings of scripture on the one hand, and between the experience of Francis and the theology of the early friars, including Bonaventure, on the other hand. But elsewhere in the New Testament we read that "God is love."[64] This designation of God would also play a leading role in the history of Christian thought, and would enter into the structure of Bonaventure's Trinitarianism, though without explicit citations from the New Testament.

Both the idea of the good and the concept of love are fundamental in Bonaventure's attempt to show the derivation of the Persons in the Trinity, and his arguments reveal how he has employed both the Neo-Platonic thought of Pseudo-Dionysius and the theological insights of Richard of St Victor in a way that is distinctively his own. In the Dionysian view, goodness is the pre-eminent attribute of God; it is the very definition of the superessential Godhead and the deepest basis for God's creative activity. Since God is good, and since the good is by nature self-diffusive, it follows that God is necessarily self-communicative. This tradition is taken up by Bonaventure and is used to argue for the necessary self-communication of the divine nature. It provides the metaphysical basis for understanding the first emanation within God as a natural emanation which flows necessarily from the dynamism of the divine nature. But, for Bonaventure, this is not sufficient for Trinitarian theology, since it specifies neither the mode nor the number of divine emanations.

To fill up the incompleteness of the Dionysian model, Bonaventure reaches to Richard's reflections on love. Richard himself had seen love as the supreme form of the good and had employed the former rather than the latter in working out his understanding of the Trinity. For Bonaventure, this approach—while not adequate in itself—can be used in conjunction with the Dionysian metaphysics to supplement the under-

---

[62] Lk. 18:19; also see Mt. 19:17.
[63] *Itin.* 5, 2 (5, 308); and 6, 2 (5, 310).
[64] 1 Jn. 4:8–16.

standing of the Trinity. This model offers the possibility of moving beyond the necessary, natural emanation to an understanding of the dynamism of the will, from which proceeds a free self-communication; this provides the basis for understanding the procession of the Spirit as an emanation *per modum liberalitatis* or *per modum amoris.* While the first approach emphasizes the necessary diffusiveness of a fecund nature, the second highlights the communication of liberality from a fecund will. While the nature is the primary principle in the generation of the Son (*natura est principium concomitante voluntate*),[65] the will is a real principle in the spiration of the Spirit (*voluntas est principium concomitante natura*).[66] Since it is the fecundity of the nature and the will from which the emanations flow, and since the intellect precisely as intellect is not fecund, Bonaventure always uses the term *per modum naturae* to designate the first procession.[67] The Augustinian tradition of an intellectual emanation is thus subsumed within this dominant framework.

While both the argument from the good and the argument from love lead to the affirmation of a plurality of Persons in God, the analysis of love provides further clues for limiting the number of Persons to three. In the general argument of the *Sentence Commentary* for the plurality of Persons,[68] the concepts of goodness and love are subsumed under the notion of beatitude. By way of contrast, in answering the question why there are only three Persons, the notion of beatitude again stands in the first place; but in the analysis of beatitude, the concept of goodness is omitted, and only the notions of *germanitas* and *caritas* are employed.[69] Here the understanding of charity as perfect love which is both liberal and shared[70] is employed to show that there must be both *dilectio* and *condilectio*; hence there can be no less than three Persons. The argument from love appears here as a necessary argument, while later the three modes

[65] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 128).

[66] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 128).

[67] Bonaventure uses the terms *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis* to designate the two Trinitarian emanations. The terms are inspired by Aristotle's principle that there exist only two perfect modes of production, namely, natural and free. *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, fm. 2 (1, 56) cites Aristotle, *Lib. II Phys.* text. 49 (c. 5); see also *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 211).

[68] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, fm. 1 (1, 53).

[69] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, fm. 1 (1, 56).

[70] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, fm. 1 (1, 56). *Amor liberalis* is seen as a love which *tendit in alterum.* The *amor communis* is described as one which *vult ilium diligi ab altero et diligere alterum.* See also the *response* (1, 57) where the first argument of necessity follows the same line of thought.

of love formulated by Richard of St Victor appear as the first argument from congruity.[71]

Bonaventure's argument is constructed around two poles which reflect both the Dionysian and the Victorine concerns. Neither of these poles can be reduced to the other, since each provides only a limited vision of the mystery of God. The same bipolar argumentation appears again in the *Itinerarium*,[72] but with a certain priority given to the Dionysian pole. In his final work, which we may see as his mature thought on the matter, the two poles are in fact presented as two parallel arguments,[73] thus confirming the view that there is a basic distinction between the argument from the good and the argument from love.

The argument from simplicity, which appears in the *Sentence Commentary*,[74] is a variation of the argument from goodness. Simplicity is understood to mean indivision, lack of composition, lack of constitutive parts, and lack of immanent actions really distinct from the essence.[75] As such, it is a pure perfection and must be posited in God, who is the highest perfection. The expansive power of the good which is concentrated in the one, simple divine essence raises unity to multiplicity without multiplying the essence. It is precisely because of his supreme simplicity that God is supremely communicable.[76] If God is most simple, he is most communicative and productive in proportion to his being. Therefore, simplicity includes a plurality of Persons.

The argument from perfection appears in different forms in the *Sentence Commentary*[77] and in the *Hexaëmeron*.[78] Perfection is understood broadly as the ability to communicate or to produce another like oneself; it refers to productive power. In the *Commentary*, this is taken primarily in the sense of a dynamic power, while in the *Hexaëmeron*, it has more of an aesthetic quality reflecting a state of being in God, including origin, order, and lack of division.[79]

All these arguments flow together into the notion of primacy (*primitas*) that lies at the heart of Bonaventure's doctrine of God. It is a concept

---

71 *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 57).
72 *Itin.* 6, 2 (5, 310–311).
73 *Hex.* 11, 11–12 (5, 381–382).
74 *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, fm. 3 (1, 53). It is found also in *Myst. Trin.* q. 3, a. 1, resp. (5, 70).
75 *I Sent.* d. 8, q. 2, au., q. 1, ad 1–4 (1, 166).
76 *I Sent.* d. 8, p. 2, q. 1, ad 1 (1, 166); d. 2, q. 2, resp. (1, 54).
77 *I Sent.* d. 2, a. 2, fm. 2 (1, 53).
78 *Hex.* 11, 6ff. (5, 381).
79 The elements of this argument will be treated further below.

which is involved in some way in the resolution of all the major Trinitarian questions: 1) the movement from unity of nature to Trinity of Persons;[80] 2) the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son;[81] 3) the impossibility of more than three Persons;[82] and 4) the personal constitution of the Father.[83] Employing the philosophical principle that a being is the cause of others because it is first, Bonaventure states that the more a being is prior, the more it is the fecund source of others.[84] This may be understood in a broad sense to speak of the divine essence with respect to the world, at which level it corresponds to the doctrine of creation. The divine nature is the rich fountain from which flows the entire created universe.[85] But Bonaventure pushes beyond this to argue that the concept of primacy may be traced into the depths of the divine nature itself, where it may be seen as the characteristic of the first divine Person. As the divine nature is absolutely prior with respect to all other essences, and thus is *a se* in the fullest sense of the word, so the Father, as that Person who is *non ab alio*, is first with respect to the other Persons. Hence, there is in God one in whom resides the fullness of divine fecundity with respect to the Persons.[86] But since whatever God is in himself he is in act, it follows that the divine fecundity with respect to God himself must be in act, and hence there must be a plurality of Persons in God.

The survey of the full range of Bonaventure's arguments reveals that his primary concern is to uncover an intelligible connection between the one divine essence and the Trinity of Persons. The concepts of goodness, primacy, love, perfection, and simplicity do this, each from a particular perspective. Underlying all the arguments is a rich and dynamic image of the divine reality. God is the infinitely rich and fecund mystery whose eternal being is a dynamic ecstasy of goodness and love. The divine nature is not a static, monadic being, but is to be conceived more as a unifying power which, in the unity of the divine fecundity, produces a plurality without multiplying the nature. The Trinity of Persons is the fruit of the

[80] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, fm. 4 (1, 53).
[81] *I Sent.* d. 11, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 215).
[82] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 57).
[83] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, resp., and ad 3 (1, 469–470).
[84] Aristotle, I *Poster.* c. 2; *Liber de Causis*, prop. 1 and 17; *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, fm. 4 (2, 53).
[85] *I Sent.* prooem. (1, 1–6).
[86] This concept of the first Person as *plenitudo fontalis* is called the *antiqua opinio* (*I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, resp. [1, 541]).

most perfect unity which, while subsisting in a multiplicity of Persons, is yet not multiplied in itself.[87]

The Constitution of Personhood

It is on the basis of the emanations that one is lead to speak of relations in God, and eventually of Persons. But, in what sense is the term *person* applicable to God? Augustine had found difficulty in using such a word, fearing it would do violence to the unity of the divine nature. Because of the nature of the problem, theologians over the centuries have attempted to find more serviceable definitions of person and a clearer articulation of the way in which we might conceive of the constitution of the Persons in the Trinity.

The Boethian definition conceived of a person as "an individual substance of a rational nature."[88] This definition would have an extensive influence in Western theology despite the obvious difficulties contained in it. If it were applied without qualification to God in a Trinitarian framework, it would seem to lead to a form of tritheism. Thus, while the definition is widely accepted by theologians, it is generally accepted only with considerable criticism, as is clearly the case with Aquinas.[89] Richard of St Victor formulated a definition which seems to avoid some of the problems inherent in the Boethian definition. The Boethian *individual substance* is replaced by the notions of *incommunicable* and *singular existence.* Recognizing the impossibility of defining the infinite yet recognizing the need of saying something, Richard defines a divine Person as an *incommunicable existence of the divine nature.*[90] Theologians following the Augustinian inspiration will tend to see the divine Persons as constituted by relations, while Richard will see them as distinguished *per originem.*[91]

After some etymological reflections on the Latin word *persona* and the Greek word *prosôpon*,[92] Bonaventure expresses a distinct preference for the Victorine definition in speaking of God, seeing it as a cor-

---

[87] *Hex.* 11, 8 (5, 381); q. 2, a. 2, fm. 6 (5, 64).

[88] Boethius, *Liber de Persona et Duabus Naturis* 3.1–5 (PL 64, 1343).

[89] *S. Th.* I, q. 29, a. 1–4.

[90] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 4.18 (181); 4.21 (186–187); 4.22 (187–188). Richard argues that the Boethian definition applies only to created persons; the term *individua subsiantia* is at the center of his critique. His own definition is presented with a clear recognition of its inadequacy: *Non inconvenienter fortassis dicere poterimus, quod persona divina sit divinae naturae incommunicabilis existentia.*

[91] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 4.15 (177–178).

[92] *I Sent.* d. 23, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1, 405).

rection of the Boethian definition.[93] But if person refers precisely to that which distinguishes the three, is it possible to use the term commonly of all three? The term certainly expresses incommunicability, and in this sense it points to the lack of commonness.[94] But Bonaventure attempts to establish a level of commonness distinct from that of the essence, yet sufficient to enable him to say that the predication implies more than an *ens rationis.* He argues that though it is true that the term *person* signifies incommunicability and therefore implies a lack of commonness, yet this incommunicability is a positive quality more than a privation. More specifically, it implies a similarity of relationship to the essence. Therefore, person is more than a mere *ens rationis*, since it refers to something real in God. Because of the similarity of relation between each Person and the divine nature, the term may be used analogously of all three,[95] just as it may be predicated analogously of God and of creatures.[96]

While in God all exists with absolute simultaneity, theology, as reflective thought that seeks to understand the inter-relationship between the various predications made about God, is intimately tied to the human experience of temporal relations. As the theologian seeks to understand the logical relations involved, those things which are really simultaneous appear in temporal language which creates the impression of prior and posterior in God. Therefore, it is inevitable that the question of the constitution of the person should arise. Generally, theologians following the Augustinian tradition tend to identify person with relation in such a way that relation is the constitutive principle of person. This is clearly the case with Aquinas, for whom relation has a dominant role to play. Bonaventure also sees the Persons as subsistent relations,[97] though this insight never assumes the centrality that it has for Aquinas. Although Bonaventure's position is not fully clear, he seems to favor the origins or processions over the relations as constitutive of the Persons. In this regard, he reflects the view of Richard, for whom the persons are distinguished *per originem.*[98] The question of the constitution of the Persons is particularly problematic in the case of the first Person. If the persons are constituted by relations, and if relation arises from procession, must not

[93] *I Sent.* d. 25, a. 1, q. 2, ad 4 (1, 441).
[94] *I Sent.* d. 25, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 442–443).
[95] *I Sent.* d. 25, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 442–443).
[96] *I Sent.* d. 25, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (1, 444–445).
[97] See Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 120–122.
[98] Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate* 4.13ff. (175–176); 5 (193–225); also Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 114–120.

the first procession logically presuppose a Person who actively generates? But if so, then the first Person is prior to the relation by which he is said to be constituted. Bonaventure's approach to this problem reveals both the centrality of the concept of primacy and his inclination to see the Persons as constituted *per originem.* He understands the actual paternity which is the active relation to the Son that constitutes him as Father in the full sense. He is Father already in an inchoative sense in as far as his personal property of being the fecund source of all others has a logical priority to any actual emanations.[99]

Relations, Properties, Notions

Relations in the Trinity are based on the two emanations. They are active generation, by which the Father generates the Son; passive generation, which is the Son's relation to the Father; active spiration, by which the Father and the Son together breathe forth the Spirit; and passive spiration, which is the Spirit's relation to the Father and the Son.[100] Intimately related to these are the concepts of property and notion, which Bonaventure uses in both a broad and in a narrow sense. In the broad sense, they are virtually synonymous and are used interchangeably. Hence, we find such combinations as: *proprietas relativa; notio, scil. personalis proprietas*, etc.

The term *notion* is used to designate the relations in as far as they provide the basis for making known something about the three persons, the term *notion* being derived from the Latin verb *innatescere.* Since all four of the relations can be seen in this way, there are at least four notions. But since the Father is distinguished by innascibility, which is not formally identical with paternity, we can conclude that there are five notions in all: innascibility, paternity, filiation, active spiration, and passive spiration.[101]

---

[99] *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212). This is treated more fully below in the discussion of the Person of the Father. Stohr, *Die Trinitätslehre*, 123, sees this as an inconsistency in Bonaventure's thought and attributes it to the Seraphic Doctor's unwillingness to place the concept of paternity higher than that of primacy. It is possible to see this in another way, for it can be interpreted as the most fundamental instance of the dialectical structure of Bonaventure's thought. The dialectical structure of the coincidence of opposites is grounded in the very mystery of the Father. On the coincidence of opposites, see Ewert Cousins, "The Coincidence of Opposites in the Christology of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 28 (1968): 27–46. George Tavard questioned Cousins' interpretation in "The Coincidence of Opposites: A Recent Interpretation of Bonaventure," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 576–84. Cousins responded in "Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites: A Response to Critics," *Theological Studies* 42 (1981): 277–290.

[100] *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).

[101] *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).

As they relate to our knowledge about God, the notions make possible a knowledge not of the essential divine attributes, but of the personal qualities of the three Persons.

In this sense, they are related to what theology calls the personal properties. Yet something that is common to several persons cannot be seen as a personal property in the strict sense. Therefore, active spiration, which is common to the Father and the Son, is not a property. This would leave four properties, as the *Sentence Commentary* indicates.[102] On the other hand, the *Breviloquium* speaks of three properties indicated by the names: Father, Son, Holy Spirit.[103] Thus, even though innascibility is proper to the Father, he is more clearly known in a positive and fuller sense through paternity; that is, through the actual generation of the Son. For this reason, paternity stands parallel to Sonship and to passive spiration as the most characteristic properties.

Since the personal properties are more than mere logical concepts, and are really distinct among themselves and yet not totally identical in all respects with the divine Persons, there are three modes of predication concerning God: the essential mode, the personal mode, and the notional mode. The essential mode of predication is that by which we speak of God in terms of his divine nature and its essential attributes; the personal mode is that whereby we speak of God in terms of properties that truly distinguish the Persons from one another; the notional mode, while distinguishing the Persons, is broader than the personal mode since it involves predications that express relations among the Persons. A brief example may help to clarify these three modes of predication. It is commonly said in Christian theology that God is love. Bonaventure distinguishes three ways in which love is predicated of God in a Trinitarian context. As an essential predication, it designates that love which pertains to the very nature of God and which is predicated of all three Persons. As a personal predication, it designates that Person who is love that is produced from perfect liberality. As a notional predication, it refers to the concord of will between the Father and Son whereby they breathe the Spirit from perfect liberality.[104] Viewed in another way, essential predications speak of the

---

[102] *I Sent.* d. 26, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 452); and, q. 4, fm. 2, and resp. (1, 460).

[103] *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).

[104] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 210); *Brev.* 1.4 (5, 212); I *Sent.* d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, fm. 1 and resp. (1, 557–558). Also, Walter Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit as Love between Father and Son," *Cord* 24 (1974): 235–256, esp. 245–246; and "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit with Reference to the Expression 'Pater et Filius diligunt

divine nature in response to the question "what" (*quid*); personal predications speak of a determinate Person in response to the question "who" (*quis*); notional predications refer to the Persons in an indeterminate way in response to the question "how" (*qui*). It would be a violation of logic to cross the lines between these three modes of predication, and would lead to confusion.

The *Father*

> It is proper to the Father to be innascible or unbegotten; to be the principle that proceeds from no other principle; to be Father as such.[105]

Characteristic of Bonaventure's doctrine of the Trinity is the peculiar emphasis given to the first Person, whose personal property is expressed in the title *Father*. Here it becomes more apparent how the concept of primacy is applied to the inner-divine life. The basis of the emanation of the created world is found in the two inner-divine emanations from which arise the Son and the Spirit; but the basis of the inner-divine emanations lies in the innascibility of the Father, in whom the fontal fullness of the Godhead is focused in a unique way. Thus, the Father receives an emphasis that would be foreign to the thought of either Augustine or Aquinas, and is similar to the theology of the classical Greek fathers. It is here that we find the pivotal point of Bonaventure's entire metaphysics of *exitus* and *reditus*, for it is the Father who is source and goal of all created reality; in him is found ultimately the *status* in which the entire creative process finds its fulfillment.[106]

To speak of the Father as innascible or unbegotten seems at first glance to be a purely negative way of defining the property of the first Person; and so it had appeared to Aquinas. But in Bonaventure's view, innascibility is not a mere negation; for it involves both a negative and a positive aspect. Negatively, it affirms a lack of origin. But to exist as one who has no origin is to be first in an absolute sense, and to exist as first is the highest of all perfections.[107] Here again we encounter Bonaventure's concept

---

se Spiritu Sancto'," in *S. Bonaventura: Volumen commemorativum*, vol. 4 (Grottaferrata: 1973–1974), 243–269.

[105] *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).

[106] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, ad 4 (1, 54). *In personis divinis est una persona, a qua sunt aliae et ad quam, et in illa est status originis, quia illa a nullo; et haec est persona patris.*

[107] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1, 470). *innascibilitas est privatio quae secundum rem est perfecta positio. Innascibilis enim dicitur Pater, quia non est ab alio; et non esse ab alio*

of primacy. That Person in God who is first is the fontal fullness; precisely as the Person who is innascible, He is the richest source of all the immanent processions and the external productions.[108]

If from revelation we know that God eternally generates a Son, then we know also that God as Father is the mystery of absolute origin and is therefore innascible, since there is nothing prior to Him.[109] It appears, then, that we come to know the Father by the relation of origin. But if generation is the act of a person who begets, is that person constituted as person by the act of generation? Or is that person constituted in his personal property prior to the act of generation?[110] For Bonaventure, the act of generation is logically prior to paternity,[111] though in reality paternity and generation are identical.[112] Viewed from the negative perspective (innascibility), the Father can be said to be constituted in his personal property prior to the act of generation, though this negative dimension is not adequate for a full understanding of the Father. Corresponding to the bipolar concept of the first Person described above, we must go beyond the negative to the complementary positive which would lead to the conclusion that the Father is constituted as Father in the full sense in the act of generation: *Ideo Pater, quia generat*.[113] The constitution of the Father, therefore, is understood in a less full and in a fuller sense, corresponding to the negative pole of innascibility and the positive pole of fecundity and primacy. This is the ultimate extension of the principle: *Principium quia primum*. Because the Father is innascible, he is absolutely first; and

---

est esse primum, et primitas est nobilis positio (. . .). Unde quia primum, ideo principium (. . .) ratio primitatis in aliquo genere est ratio principiandi (. . .). Pater principium totius divinitatis, quia a nullo.

[108] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1, 470) and *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212). That we are here dealing with a particular concern of Bonaventure is reflected not only in the content but also in the length of the treatment given to the question in the *Sentence Commentary.*

[109] This bipolar concept of the Father may be seen as underlying much of the dialectical style of Bonaventure's thought. It is seen by Ewert Cousins as the real basis for the thought pattern described as the coincidence of opposites, which Cousins traces throughout Bonaventure's system. In this instance, innascibility and fecundity are mutually complementary opposites that cannot be formally reduced to one or the other; the Father is generative power precisely because he is unbegotten.

[110] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2 (1, 468) where the question is raised: *utrum hypostasis Patris sive Pater ideo generat, quia Pater est, vel ideo sit pater, quia generat*. Bonaventure's position favors the latter: *Pater, quia generat*.

[111] *Sent*. d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1, 469): *prius est generare quam esse patrem secundum ordinem intelligendi*.

[112] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 1 (1, 468): *omnino sunt eadem proprietas secundum rem.* However, they signify in different ways at the logical level.

[113] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 469).

because he is absolutely first, he is the fecund source of others. Because he is innascible, he is known as Father, but he is Father in the fullest sense in the act of generation. The philosophical principle drawn from the *Liber de causis* has been fully exploited to single out the Father as the dynamic source whose fecundity finds its first expression in the two inner-divine emanations.[114]

Paternity, then, is the notion that best designates the first Person in his personal property; since it designates him in a positive sense, innascibility or primacy lies at the root of the personal character of the Father. It is in paternity that he finds the fullness of his personal reality.[115] While innascibility is logically prior, paternity is that which distinguishes the Father fully from the other Persons.[116]

Other notions that pertain to the Father are spirator and principle. Spirator designates him, together with the Son, as the source of the Spirit, while principle designates him as the point of origin for the immanent processions and as ultimate source of all creation. Thus, he is principle in a two-fold sense; namely, principle precisely as point of origin for another when no causal relationship is involved; and principle as cause with respect to created reality.

In this understanding of the proper characteristic of the Father, we see the ultimate basis of Bonaventure's metaphysical system whereby all comes forth from the Father and returns to the Father.[117] Not only does the gift of existence flow from the Father, but the gifts of knowledge and grace as well, coming to us from the loving Father who loves us with the same act of love by which he loves the Son and the Spirit. The religious development of the human person is nothing other than the entrance of the created spirit into that life-giving and beatifying movement of all reality from the Father and to the Father; and in this is rooted the spiritual journey of humankind.[118]

---

[114] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1, 471): *primitas in prima persona est ratio producendi alias; et quia innascibilis dicit primitatem, hinc est quod dicit fontalem plenitudinem respectu productionis personalis.*

[115] *I Sent.* d. 29, dub. (1, 517); d. 28, q. 3, resp. (1, 501): *Proprietas personalis Patris est patemitas, non innascibilitas.*

[116] *I Sent.* d. 28, dub. 1 (1, 504): *Distinctio (. . .) quasi inchoatur in innascibilitate (. . .) consummatur in paternitate.*

[117] *Hex.* 1, 17 (5, 332): *Per primariam veritatem omnes redire debent, ut, sicut Filius dixit: Exivi a Patre et veni in mundum; iterum relinquo mundum et vado ad Patrem; sic dicat quilibet: Domine, exivi a te summo, venio ad te summum et per te summum.*

[118] *Myst. Trin.* q. 8, ad 7 (5, 115).

The *Son*

> Sacred scripture says that God has an offspring whom he loves supremely, a Word coequal with him 'whom he begot in eternity and in whom he has disposed all things.'[119]

As we have seen above, God is by his very nature a mystery, a self-diffusive good. It is, therefore, the emanations from that primal goodness, focused most radically in the Father, that give rise to the two other divine Persons. The emanations, consequently, are modes of production immanent to the life of God. To clarify more exactly the meaning of these productive emanations, Bonaventure has recourse to the philosophy of Aristotle. There are three types of emanations, writes the Philosopher, fortuitous, natural, and voluntary.[120] But since Bonaventure could see nothing fortuitous in God, he considers only the latter two and concludes that there are only two perfect modes of emanation which are found in God who is the supremely communicative good. Thus are derived the two terms *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis* to designate the two inner-divine emanations.[121]

Since generation is a mode of communicating reality from one being to another, and since God is supremely communicative and the source of all communication, generation ought to be present in him in some way.[122] In searching for an analogue to clarify the meaning of generation in God, Bonaventure chooses that sort of generation by which one organic, living being emerges from another.[123] The superiority of this type of production lies in the fact that here is found the most complete likeness between the producer and that which he produces. If we were to remove any type of imperfection from this example, it could serve as an analogy for speaking of God. We must say, for example, that in God the one who is produced is not separated from the producer and has no need to grow, but is produced totally in his full perfection. Nor is the one produced formed from a part of the divine substance. Rather, the one who produces communicates

---

[119] *Brev.* 1, 2 (5, 211).

[120] Aristotle, *Meta.* 6, t. 22 (Bekker 1032, a 12–13).

[121] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, fm. 2 (1, 56); *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 211).

[122] *I Sent.* d. 9, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 181).

[123] *I Sent.* d. 9, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 181). Other types of production, which he rejects as less adequate, are: 1) the manner of production whereby a ring produces an image in wax; 2) the production found in the inorganic realm, as a fire can be produced from wood (*sic generatur elementum ab elemento*). These seem far less adequate than the type of production found at the level of living beings.

totally the substance of divinity to the one produced.[124] When all imperfections are thus removed from the example, it is possible to say that God, as Father, generates a Son by communicating the whole of his substance to his offspring. The Son proceeds from the Father *substantialiter et originaliter*,[125] in the sense that he has his source in the Father.

When generation is conceived in this way, the result is the existence of a total, personal similitude. Such likeness pertains to the essence of the concept of generation. Thus, while the analogy of generation provides the basis for designating the term of the generative act as *Son*, the element of perfect likeness leads to the use of the terms *Word* and *Image.*[126]

As we have indicated above, Bonaventure's understanding of the generation of the Son is ultimately rooted in the Dionysian metaphysics of the good. This implies a certain type of necessity which is expressed in the term: emanation *per modum naturae*; for at this level, God is conceived in terms of a necessary self-communication which arises by reason of his very nature as the good. The term *natural emanation* expresses an understanding of generation different from that of Augustine and Aquinas, both of whom prefer to speak of this as an emanation by way of the intellect. Bonaventure also sees the intellect to be involved. But his guiding light is the concept of primal, fecund goodness. The intellect precisely as intellect is not fecund; it is so only in as far as it springs from the fecund nature of God. Thus, the primary principle of the Son's generation is the divine nature; the natural fecundity of the Neo-Platonic tradition dominates this understanding. The Augustinian tradition is integrated within this framework. That which flows from the divine essence naturally does so as a perfect self-expression of the Father; it is the Word of the intellect.[127]

The generation of the Son cannot be conceived in this way without raising the question of necessity and the relation of such generation to the divine will. Without doubt, there is a type of necessity involved here. But how is it to be conceived? Of the many types of necessity that can be distinguished,[128] only the necessity of immutability may be applied to God. It cannot be a necessity that is imposed on him from outside himself;

---

[124] *I Sent.* d. 5, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 115).

[125] *I Sent.* d. 5, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 115).

[126] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 1, fm. 5 (1, 481); d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 488); d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, fm. 3 (1, 541). These names for the second Person will be treated more fully below.

[127] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 496): *sic verbum intellectus a mente procedit per modum naturae per omnia ei simile et aequale.*

[128] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 125ff.); *Qq. Dd.* Q 7, a. 1–2 (5, 106–112). The following types of necessity are distinguished:

nor can it be any sort of divine need for a created being as the necessary condition for his existence as God. It can only be the inner necessity of the divine being to be always and completely self-sufficient and totally in conformity with itself.[129] Because God is totally self-sufficient and completely true to his nature as the fecund good, he can and will communicate the totality of his substance without losing his own identity. He who is fully sufficient in his own being, precisely for that reason, can be fully self-communicative without threat to himself. In this sense, the necessity of immutability sheds further light on the generation of the Son.

Is there, then, no relation between this generation and the divine will? Since the divine nature and the divine will are really identical, that which pertains to the nature cannot be totally unrelated to the will. Just as there is a relation between the divine intellect and generation, so there is a relation between the divine will and generation. The will can be viewed in two principal ways; either as the principal productive power, or as a will that accompanies and approves that which proceeds from the nature.[130] The will as a productive power is reserved by Bonaventure for the analysis of the procession of the Holy Spirit. As regards the generation of the Son, since this proceeds from the nature as from its primary principle, the will accompanies the act of generation as *approbans*.[131] Thus, Bonaventure can conclude that the Son is produced *ut omnino similis et per modum naturae, nihilominus ut dilectus*;[132] although he proceeds by necessity of nature, the Son proceeds as the Beloved of the Father. The creaturely categories

a) *Disconveniens*	*Violence*:	One is moved against his nature from outside.
	Coaction:	One is moved against his will from outside.
b) *Deficiens*	*Indigence*:	The needs integral to a nature with respect to something external to it; e.g., food and drink as needs of human beings.
	Inevitability:	A necessity arising from some defect; e.g., death because of sin.
c) *Conveniens*	*Exigence*:	Found in a principle that has a natural ordination to another; e.g., matter has exigence for form.
	Completion:	Also called "necessity of immutability." It is totally immanent to the nature involved.

[129] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 126): *Quia ipse solus est qui sibi omnino sufficit et qui secum omnino convenit.*

[130] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 127–128).

[131] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 127–128): *natura est primum principium, concomitante voluntate.*

[132] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 127–128).

of necessity and freedom are transcended in the dialectical unity of the necessity of immutability with the accompanying and approving will.

The Son, who proceeds from the Father as a Word, proceeds by way of exemplarity.[133] Exemplarity has a critical role to play in Bonaventure's thought both at the philosophical and at the theological levels. It is only exemplarity that can unlock the deepest meaning of created reality to the human mind, for it is only when we perceive the world in its symbolic nature as the objectification of the self-knowledge of God that we know it in its true reality. In the most basic sense, it is God in his own self-knowledge who is the exemplar of all else; but since God exists only as a Trinity, exemplarity refers to the entire Trinity. But in a special manner, the mystery of the Trinity itself is reflected in the mystery of the second Person. As the full and total expression of God's primal fruitfulness, the Son is simultaneously the expression of all that God can be in relation to the finite. The question of exemplarity, therefore, is fundamental to any consideration of Bonaventure's treatment of the generation of the Son.

The question is raised first of all in the discussion of the generative act in God.[134] Here Bonaventure distinguishes two ways in which a procession of exemplarity can be understood. The first way refers to the *exemplatum* in the proper sense; that is, it refers to a being which is truly other than and distinct from the original which it resembles. Understood in this way, it is the created world that is the *exemplatum* proceeding from God as from its exemplar.[135] The second way refers to the very *ratio exemplandi*,[136] that is, to the very basis in God himself for all exemplarity. This refers to the emanation of the Son who is the Word of God's self-expression in whom God disposes all things. Quoting St Augustine,[137] the Seraphic Doctor describes this as the divine art of all living things, whence flows the truth and beauty of all things;[138] as the representation of God, the Word is also the model of all God does and can do. Such a mode of procession can only be a natural one and stands in contrast with the emanation of

---

[133] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 3, fm. 1 (1, 129).

[134] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 1–3 (1, 124–130). The question of generation in God is treated in three questions: 1) Whether the generation of the Son is necessary; 2) Whether it proceeds from the will of God; and 3) Whether it proceeds in an exemplary way. The content of the first two questions has been analyzed above.

[135] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 129): *sic creatura procedit a Deo tanquam exemplatum ab exemplari, et sic exemplar importat causalitatem formalem respectu exemplati.*

[136] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 129).

[137] Augustine, *De Trinitate* 6.10.11 (CCLS 50, 241).

[138] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 130); *Brev.* 1, 8 (5, 216); *Hex.* 1, 13 (5, 331).

creatures whose production flows from a decree of the divine will. Thus, while at one level the whole of the Trinity is exemplary with respect to the world, at another level the mystery of exemplarity is concentrated in a unique way in the Son. To speak of him as exemplar designates not a mere appropriation, but a property of the second Person.[139] The triune structure of God himself is expressed in the Son.[140] The relation between Father and Son is the first and primal relation, and the basis for all other relations. So it is that, as the Word is the inner self-expression of God, the created order is the external expression of the inner Word. Whatever created reality exists possesses in its inner constitution a relation to the uncreated Word; and since the Word, in turn, is the expression of the inner Trinitarian structure of God, that which is created as an expression of the Word bears the imprint of the Trinity.

The Titles of the Second Person

> By the fact that he is Son, he is also Image, and for that very reason, he is Word.[141]

Scripture speaks of the second Person not only as Son, but also as Image and as Word. Bonaventure employs each of these titles to express particular aspects of the mystery of the second person. The Son is he who is conceived from the depths of divine goodness; Image designates him precisely as self-likeness; but Word adds over and above this that he is the *ratio exprimendi et manifestandi.*[142]

Son

It is clear from Bonaventure's approach to the major Trinitarian questions that the first title to be applied to the second Person is the title of Son. This title names a person precisely in as far as he is begotten by another as a distinct person who is the perfect likeness of the generative source and who is intimately related to its source by love.[143] In this description can be seen the major elements involved in Bonaventure's analysis of generation. Central to that notion of generation is the likeness between the producer

---

139 *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 3, ad 4 (1, 130).
140 *Hex.* 9, 2 (5, 373); 3, 7 (5, 344).
141 *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542).
142 *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 488).
143 *I Sent.* d. 31, q. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542); *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).

and the one produced.[144] Corresponding to the natural emanation is the idea that the Son represents a likeness in the order of nature. In as far as the term of the emanation is a hypostasis, it is called also a hypostatic likeness or a personal likeness.

Although the title Son is the first designation of the second Person, and is in full harmony with the general framework of the theology developed by Bonaventure, it has decided limitations; for it designates the Son only in terms of his relation to the Father.[145] There is much more that can and must be said about the second Person, and this will appear under Bonaventure's analysis of Image and Word. But even though the range of significance for this title is limited, it has the decided advantage of emphasizing the fact that the fruit of the first divine emanation is fully and totally personal being as is the Father. The term lends itself to further interpretation through the analysis of the modalities of love. While the Father is love that is totally active and communicative, and the Spirit is love that is totally receptive, the Son is that modality of love *ab utroque permixtus*;[146] he is love as first receptive and then as responsive and communicative. From all eternity, therefore, the Son is one who is totally from the Father and totally responsive to the Father. If we recall that the relation between Father and Son is the ontological basis of all other relations, it appears that created reality should bear the stamp of sonship in the deepest core of its being. As the Son is from the Father, so all created reality is at root the pure reception of being. As the Son responds to the Father and in his response together with the Father breathes forth the Spirit, so all created reality is destined to return to the Father.[147] We see here the basis for the metaphysical structure of *egression—regressio* which we have already referred to in speaking of the mystery of the Father. The whole of creation is stamped by this law of sonship—both in its overarching structure and history, and in particular creatures. It is above all in humanity that this

---

[144] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 1, ad 4 (1, 483). It is proper to the Father alone to beget a Word. While the Son and the Spirit know themselves, they do not beget a Word from themselves, because they do not possess the *fecunditas ad generandum*, which is the Father's alone. It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish between the essential act of knowledge and the notional act. The first is common to all three Persons; by virtue of it, each knows himself and the other Persons together with all created things. The second is that act by which the Father produces the Word from his fecund self-knowledge.

[145] *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542): *Sed filius dicit solum respectum ad Patrem.*

[146] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 57); *Itin.* 6, 2 (5, 311); *III Sent.* d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (3, 29ff.).

[147] *I Sent.* d. 2, q. 2, ad 4 (1, 54): *In primo est status* is here applied specifically to the Father.

ontological structure may be perceived, where we find created beings who are consciously present in time and who experience the polarity between origins and eschatology, that is, *exitus* and *reditus*. In each present moment of existence, the human person is called to the active, personal response of trust, love, and hope in the fulfillment of its being, which is ultimately beyond itself. Thus, although from one perspective, the meaning of the title Son is limited in scope, from another perspective it has a remarkable theological depth which aids in clarifying more adequately the personal ground of the created world.

Image

The title Image adds yet another dimension of meaning to the understanding of the second Person. In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure writes that this term emphasizes the degree of likeness; it is *expressed* and *conformed*,[148] and may be called a true imitation. It means far more than a mere chance or superficial resemblance. While the Son does not imitate the Father in the latter's strictly personal property of *being without source*, yet the imitation goes so far as to include the reflection of the Father's character as *source of others*.[149]

This is clarified in more detail in the *Sentence Commentary*. When the term Image is applied to God, it signifies not only expression but the highest expression.[150] Such an expression involves two elements: 1) that it be one expression of one being; 2) that it be an expression in every respect. That being which is supremely one will find its highest self-expression not in a multiplicity of images, but in one only, which would be the most perfect reflecting likeness. Unless such an image would reflect its source in every way possible, it would not express it in the highest degree.

The first element leads Bonaventure to conclude that only the Son is truly the Image of the Father, because only he proceeds from one Person alone, while the Spirit proceeds from two Persons, expressing both of them, and hence expressing neither of them in the fullest degree.[151]

The explanation of the second element is considerably fuller, and it is especially here that we see how the title Image has a wider range of significance than the title Son. While Son designates only the relation of the

---

148 *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).
149 *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).
150 *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542); d. 3, p. 2, dub. 4 (1, 94); d. 27, p. 2, dub. 2 (1, 491).
151 *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542); d. 3, p. 2, dub. 4 (1, 94); d. 27, p. 2, dub. 2 (1, 491).

second Person to the Father, Image designates the Son's relation to the Father *a quo est*, as well as his relation to the Spirit, *qui ex ipso est*.[152] In terms of the first relation, the Son proceeds naturally from the Father as Word and Species and as a totally expressive likeness. The second relation involves the fact that the Son is coprinciple with the Father in the spiration of the Spirit. As Image, therefore, his likeness approaches the very property of the Father Himself. Though it does not push to the level of innascibility in its negative side, it does include the reflection of the positive side; the Son, like the Father and together with the Father, is the active source of another.[153] Thus it becomes clear why the term Image is applied only to the Son and not to the Spirit.

Word

Bonaventure frequently expresses a preference for the title *Word*, which appears to him to be the richest in meaning. In the *Sentence Commentary*, he contrasts it with the previous two titles briefly by saying that it expresses the relation of the second Person both to the Father and to creation.[154] In his *Commentary on John*, this is expressed far more elaborately:

> The term "word" expresses not only a relation to the one speaking, but to that which is expressed through the word, to the sound with which it clothes itself, and to the knowledge effected in others through the mediation of the word. And since here the Son of God is to be described not only in terms of his relation to the Father from whom he proceeds, but also in terms of his relation to the creatures which he has made, as well as to the flesh with which he was clothed and to the truth which he has given us, He is most nobly and fittingly described as the Word; for that name includes all these relations, and a more fitting name could not be found anywhere in the world.[155]

Here the second Person is related not only to the Father, but to the entire mystery of creation, revelation, and incarnation. He is seen as the one through whom all the Father's self-communications take place. As the Word is the self-expression of the Father within the Godhead, the world is the external objectification of that self-utterance in that which is not God. And the humanity of Jesus is the fullest objectification of that self-utterance within the created world.

---

[152] *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542); d. 3, p. 2, dub. 4 (1, 94); d. 27, p. 2, dub. 2 (1, 491).
[153] *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542); d. 3, p. 2, dub. 4 (1, 94); d. 27, p. 2, dub. 2 (1, 491).
[154] *I Sent.* d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 542); d. 3, p. 2, dub. 4 (1, 94); d. 27, p. 2, dub. 2 (1, 491).
[155] *Comm. Jn.* c. I, p. 1, q. 1 (6, 247).

In explicating the meaning of the Word, Bonaventure draws extensively on the human experience of self-consciousness and knowledge, making full use of the elements of the cognitive process: concept, word, and vocal expression.[156] Bonaventure distinguishes a twofold speaking. There is an inner speaking to oneself, a speaking in the spirit, which is none other than our awareness of self or of another. This inner presence of that which is known is a sort of spiritual process of conception and birth, which terminates in an inner word or conscious knowledge of that which is known. This inner speech precedes any external speaking whereby the inner word is communicated to another spiritual being.[157] Transferring the genesis of knowledge and speech analogically from the human person to God,[158] Bonaventure shows again to what extent the generation of the Word is a natural generation. God is the supreme form of spiritual being, and as such, he is both perfectly simple and supremely fecund. It cannot be, therefore, that he is in any way less than the created spirit found in the human person. If self-consciousness and self-knowledge are truly perfections of spiritual being, it follows that they must be found in God in the highest degree. Such self-knowledge is called an inner word: "A word is nothing other than an expressed and expressive likeness conceived by the power of an intelligent spirit by which it knows itself or another."[159] The inner Word of God, therefore, is the self-knowledge of God precisely as goodness and love, as fecund source of all that is and can be. In his inner Word, God knows not only himself, but all the ways in which he can communicate himself to others, including this actual world-order and all other possible worlds which will never be created. Such self-knowledge flows from the very nature of God as spiritual being that is goodness and love, and hence is to be distinguished from the speaking of the external word, which is not an act of nature but an act of the will. Thus, the external word which proceeds from God is not to be identified with God; it is a creature. Though it is other than God in being, yet it reflects the mystery of God, since the divine Trinity is the fecund exemplar of all actual and possible things.[160]

---

[156] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 487).

[157] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 482).

[158] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 482); q. 2, resp. (1, 485).

[159] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 488).

[160] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 482). Bonaventure distinguishes between *loqui ad se* and *loqui ad alterum.* The first refers to the inner act of intellectual generation, whose term is the conceived word. As it refers to God, it designates the *verbum natum et aeternum.* The second refers to the projection of our knowledge in an external form; it is the

In summary, the title *Word* designates the second person precisely as the perfect imitative likeness of the Father who is the fecund source of all (= *similitudo Patris imitativa*); but precisely as such, he is simultaneously the exemplar of creation (= *similitudo rerum exemplativa*). Thus he holds a middle place, as it were, between the Father and the world, and it is through the Word that the Father himself is operative (= *similitudo operativa*).[161]

The Son as Center

Already in the *Sentence Commentary*, Bonaventure conceives of the second Person as the center of the life of the Trinity, thus establishing a motif which would eventually assume far-reaching significance in his later writings. In the text just cited, Bonaventure sees the Word as holding a middle place between the Father and the world. But as regards the inner life of God himself, the person of the Son is placed at the very center of the divine reality.

This appears first in the derivation of the divine emanation from the analysis of love. Following the Victorine tradition, Bonaventure distinguishes a love which is totally *gratuitus* and another which is totally *debitus*; between them is a modality of love which is *ab utroque permixtus*;[162] one which gives, one which receives, and one which both receives and gives. The same type of structure appears if we view the Persons in terms of the mystery of origin. There is one Person who is origin alone; there is another who comes forth but is in no way the origin of another; there is a third who both comes forth and is the principle of another.[163] The underlying structure may be seen in the following schema:

---

verbum prolatum. As applied to God, it signifies the *verbum creatum et temporale.* Therefore, there is a most intimate relation between God's inner speaking and his external speaking, and hence between the Word and the world. Indeed, the Word is the *mundus archetypus. I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, q. 2, resp. (1, 485); *Hex.* 3, 4 (5, 343–344). While there is a strong line of continuity between the inner and outer word, Bonaventure's doctrine of the analogy of being excludes any Hegelian interpretation of the God-world relationship.

[161] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 485): *Verbum, quod est similitudo Patris imitativa et similitudo rerum exemplativa et similitudo operativa; et ita tenet quasi medium, et dicitur Pater operari per Verbum.*

[162] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 57); *Itin.* 6, 2 (5, 311).

[163] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 57); *Itin.* 6, 2 (5, 311).

Totally active and communicative	→	First receptive and then communicative	←	Totally passive and receptive

These conform fully to Bonaventure's understanding of the three Persons and the mystery of the eternal emanations. Here also is the metaphysical basis for the Bonaventurean aesthetics of order.[164] In viewing the world, he sees the beauty of its order to consist in the fact that all things have a beginning, a middle, and an end. In this way, they can be seen to reflect the orderly life of the triune God in whom there may be seen an analogous structure.

The theme of the center would become ever more crucial in Bonaventure's thought, finding its most consistent and compact expression in the *Hexaëmeron*,[165] where we find it applied to all levels of the mystery of Christ. The eternal Son who is the center of the Trinity, and who mediates all the divine works of creation and illumination, in becoming incarnate, assumes his place as the center of the created universe and its history. Thus, theology, Christology, anthropology, creation, illumination, and revelation are brought together tightly around the one universal center of meaning.

Not only does all emanate from the Father through the Word; but the return of all things back to the Father can take place only through the same Word who stands at the very center of reality. And through the whole of the divine economy, the Seraphic Doctor can see a common principle operative, which reflects the universal mediatorial significance of the Word: "It is the law of the divinity that lower beings be led to the highest beings by means of beings that lie in the middle between the extremes."[166]

Together with the Father, the Son may be designated by the notion *spirator*; for both together constitute one principle of a common spiration. Since the Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, the Son

---

[164] See J.A. Wayne Hellmann, *Ordo: Untersuchung eines Grundgedankens in der Theologie Bonaventuras* (Paderborn: 1974); English, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*, trans. Jay M. Hammond (Saint Bonaventure: 2001). The whole of this study is devoted to the concept of *ordo* and its far-reaching significance in the total thought of the Seraphic Doctor. Hellmann has succeeded admirably in elaborating the metaphysical and Christological grounding of the concept.

[165] *Hex.* 1, 10–39 (5, 330–335).

[166] *Brev.* 2, 9 (5, 226).

also may be called *principle*; but to distinguish him from the Father, it is necessary to qualify this as *principle from another*. The term expresses both his relation to the Father and his relation to the Spirit; He is totally from the Father; and together with the Father, he is the principle from which the Spirit comes.

The Holy Spirit

The Holy Spirit proceeds as love; He is the Gift in whom all gifts are given.[167]

It is above all in the emanation of the Holy Spirit that we discover Bonaventure's personal appropriation of the Victorine tradition. While it was possible to use the Dionysian argument from the good to arrive at a plurality springing from the dynamism of the divine nature, it was not only possible but necessary to augment this by the personal and psychological dimensions present in the Victorine analysis of love. Corresponding to the natural emanation of the Son, Bonaventure also posits an emanation proceeding from pure liberality; for God is not an impersonal good, but the primal good existing precisely as supreme personal good. But the perfect actuality of personal being is to exist as love, and love is an act of the will from which flows all liberality. If, then, God is to be conceived of as a personal God, there must be in Him liberality as well.[168] For Bonaventure, this is the question of the procession of the Spirit who proceeds *per modum voluntatis*;[169] since the divine nature which is supremely fecund can do no other than produce a Person, so also the divine will which is supremely liberal can do no less.[170]

The argument from love first appears in the *Sentence Commentary* as one of the arguments for a plurality in God. It appears there in a simple form: *Caritas non sit amor privatus, sed ad alterum*.[171] It is used later to argue for limiting the number of Persons to three, since love exists in three primary modalities.[172] In treating the question of the emanation of the Spirit, it becomes necessary to give greater precision to the meaning of the term *love.*

---

[167] *I Sent* d. 6, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 129).
[168] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1, 195).
[169] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 128): *Processus per modum voluntatis concomitante natura.*
[170] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1, 95).
[171] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 2, fm. 1 (1, 53).
[172] *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 57).

In Bonaventure's view, love is the first of all the affections and root of all the others.[173] Love is the gift in which all other gifts are given, and without which nothing else is truly a gift. Love is the most noble of the affections because it involves true liberality and generosity.

As the term is applied to God, it is understood at three levels: 1) love as essential; 2) love as notional; and 3) love as personal.[174] Essential love designates that love which is found in all three Persons by reason of their nature as God, by which they love themselves; it is divine love in the absolute sense. Notional love is that which is common to the Father and the Son, the act by which each is turned to the other in mutual love. This is the summit of love, for nothing is more delightful than mutual love; and without love, nothing else is truly enjoyable. Yet, if love is directed to another, then the mutual love of two directed to each other would become a sort of mutual narcissism if they did not mutually turn their love to a third who could share it.[175] It is this mutual love between the Father and the Son which is called *concord*,[176] and from it proceeds the Spirit. Bonaventure clarifies this with the following example.[177] The love between a husband and wife by which they intend to live together is called social love, and may be taken as an analogue for the essential love in God. Their conjugal love by which they love each other with a view to begetting a child corresponds to the concord between the Father and the Son. If their mutual love were to bring forth only a spiritual emanation between them, that emanation—their spiritual offspring—could justifiably be called *amor*. When, in fact, such love finds its fruit in the begetting of a child, the child is called not *amor*, but *amatus*; it is not love itself, but is the loved one. Applying the analogy to the Trinity, Bonaventure concludes that that which proceeds in liberality from the concord between the Father and the Son is truly and properly *amor*. He is love because he proceeds from perfect liberality; he is Person because, although he is distinguished from those who produce him, yet he cannot be distinguished from them in essence. The distinction, therefore, must be one of Person.[178]

---

[173] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1, 197). See also Robert Prentice, *The Psychology of Love according to St. Bonaventure* (New York: 1957), 80–81.

[174] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 201).

[175] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, fm. 1 (1, 194–195): *Perfectior est dilectio mutua quam reflexa, et perfectior adhuc mutua communicata quam non communicata, quia talis scilicet non communicata, videtur sapere amorem libidinosum.*

[176] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 201).

[177] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 201).

[178] *I Sent*. d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 201).

It is in this sense that the Spirit is called personal love; and his procession is designated as an emanation *per modum voluntatis, concomitante natura.*[179]

This sheds light on the question of the relation of Father and Son to the Spirit. The Spirit is personal love that proceeds from the mutual love between the Father and the Son who, as one principle, breathe forth the Spirit. Fully aware of the Greek position on this question,[180] Bonaventure expounds his thesis quite fully, presenting arguments both from cripture and from theological reasoning. The scriptural arguments are drawn from Jn. 15:16, Jn. 16:14, and Gal. 4:6, texts which indicate that the Spirit is the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son. The arguments reflect Bonaventure's economic Trinitarian style clearly in as far as each is based on the factual correspondence between the mission of the Spirit in the history of grace and the eternal emanation. Accordingly, the one who is sent by the Father and Son in history is the one who proceeds from the Father and Son eternally.

The first three theological arguments are drawn from titles commonly used to name the Spirit; gift, love, and bond.[181] Scripture designates the Spirit as the gift given us by the Son, and both the Greeks and the Latins agree on this. But the gift is given only by a person from whom the gift proceeds; therefore, if the historical mission corresponds to the eternal emanation, the Spirit must proceed from the Son. Since it is theologically undisputed that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, it follows that he must proceed from both the Father and the Son. It is commonly held that the Spirit proceeds as love; but love is not in the Father alone but in the Son as well. If love proceeds from the Father, it proceeds from the Son as well. A third commonly used title for the Spirit is *bond*; for he is the

---

[179] *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 128). Other terms used by Bonaventure are *procedens per mutuum amorem* and *per modum liberalitatis.*

[180] *I Sent.* d. 11, au., q. 1 (1, 209–213); Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 56ff. Bonaventure's response is devoted totally to the discussion of the Latin-Greek controversy. He sees the Greeks to be using analogies that are more material and therefore less apt than the analogies used by Latin theology. In doing so, the Greek position limits the understanding of scripture to the temporal procession of the Spirit and thus leads to a distortion in the understanding of the doctrine. Concerning the actual profession of faith in the Greek understanding, Bonaventure's judgment is harsh, seeing the error to proceed from ignorance, pride, and stubbornness and leading to heresy and schism. Bonaventure stands in close relation to the *Summa Halensis* (I, q. 43, m. 4); none of the content of Bonaventure's position is original to him, though it is presented in a more compact and orderly way. To what degree this understanding of the Greek position is an accurate reflection of their own theology remains a disputed question.

[181] *I Sent.* d. 11, au., q. 1 (1, 210–211) for all the following arguments.

bond between the Father and the Son. But he would be a bond in a more perfect sense if he stood in an immediate relation to both of the other persons than if he stood in an immediate relation to one and in a mediate relation to the other. The understanding of bond may be further clarified by the argument from *germanitas.* The relation between two productive persons is more intimate if, in the act of production, they are not independent of each other, but mutually related in the productive act. Such an intimate interrelation would include a greater degree of unity between them, and consequently a greater degree of bliss. The final theological argument clearly reflects what was said earlier concerning the Son as the Image of the Father. The Son would be a more perfect Image of the Father if he reflected the Father not only in terms of his divine nature, but also in terms of his personal property, if that be possible without negating the identity of the Father. As Image, the Son shares in the positive dimension of the mystery of the Father, that aspect which designates the Father as the fecund source of others. Thus, without sharing in the negative dimension of innascibility, the Son, like the Father and together with the Father, is the source of another to whom, with the Father, he communicates the divine nature.

Throughout, Bonaventure sees the Father and Son in terms of the greatest intimacy. So great is their intimacy that the Spirit proceeds from them as from one principle, in as far as they are one in the fecundity of the divine will.[182] Again, the notion of primacy appears in the argument. Both the Father and the Son are logically prior to the procession of love and therefore possess the full fecundity of the divine will. Since this fruitfulness is but one, and is found in both the Father and the Son, they must be seen as one unified principle of the Spirit. Corresponding to the property of the Father, in whom the fullness of primacy resides, he is prior to both emanations. The Son, on the other hand, is himself generated but is prior to the second emanation. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son not precisely in as far as they are different, but in as far as there is one fecund will in both of them.[183]

Although the Father and the Son are together involved in the act of spiration, a distinction must be made between them since the Father is the source of the Son. Consequently, the Son's ability to spirate is a power which he receives from the Father. This must be understood to

[182] *I Sent.* d. 11, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 215).
[183] *I Sent.* d. 11, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 215).

refer strictly to priority of origin and in no way to a priority in duration or causality.[184] In this sense, it is possible to say that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *principaliter et per se*.[185] From this perspective, it is possible to say that the Spirit proceeds both mediately and immediately. He proceeds mediately in as far as he proceeds from the Son who himself proceeds from the Father. But he proceeds immediately in as far as he proceeds from the Father, who proceeds from no other source.[186]

The emanation of the Spirit is from the most perfect act of will. Yet the liberality from which he proceeds must be clearly distinguished from the freedom by which God creates the world. The liberality by which the Spirit emanates is a necessary quality of the mystery of divine love, while the freedom by which God creates involves an emanation which can in no way be qualified as necessary. As in treating the emanation of the Son, Bonaventure distinguishes that which necessarily proceeds from God as the exemplar of all reality and is therefore the very *ratio exemplandi* from that which proceeds as *exemplatum*; so also here, he distinguishes between the emanation of the Spirit as the very *ratio volendi* from the *volitum*, or created reality as an actual object of the divine will.[187] Viewing the two emanations together, we can conclude that the created world is known by God in the knowledge whereby he generates the Son, and is loved by him in the love by which he spirates the Spirit. But while the inner emanations are intrinsic to his very nature as supreme goodness and love, the actual projection of the world as an external expression of is knowledge and love remains always a non-necessitated act. God does not need the world in order to exist as God, for the full and necessary self-communication of goodness and love resides in God himself prior to any further self-communication. It is precisely this which allows the act of creation to be radically free on the part of God and which accounts for the radical contingence of the present world-order.

In the light of the above, we can now grasp Bonaventure's understanding of the traditional proposition that the Father and the Son love each

---

184 *I Sent.* d. 12, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 220–221).

185 *I Sent.* d. 12, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 222).

186 *I Sent.* d. 12, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 223).

187 *I Sent.* d. 6, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 29). To proceed from liberality can be taken in two ways: 1) that which proceeds is itself not liberality, but something that comes from liberality. In this way, the world comes to be; 2) to proceed as the very *ratio liberalitatis*. This is to proceed as love. He who proceeds in this way is the gift in which all gifts are given. Also, *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1 (1, 195) expresses the difference by using the terms *volitum* and *ratio volendi*, or *donatum* and *ratio donandi*.

other by the Holy Spirit.[188] In no way does the Spirit exercise an active role with respect to the Father and the Son. If he is called the bond between them, this is to be understood not in an active sense, as though he did something to join them, but in a passive sense; namely, in the sense that he proceeds from each of them in as far as they are actively united with each other in love (= notional love). The Spirit is the bond, not because he gives something to the other Persons, but because he is fully receptive. If we were to put this in the language of cause-and-effect, Bonaventure sees the Spirit as more similar to an effect than to a cause. Therefore, the ablative case found in the phrase "by the Holy Spirit" must be applied to love as notional, which refers to the fecundity of the will found in only the first two Persons, whereby they are able to produce a third Person. The Father and Son are said to be joined in the Holy Spirit, or by the Holy Spirit, not in the sense that they receive something from him, but in the sense that there is something in them (= notional love) whereby they are the principle of the Spirit.

The two immanent emanations are distinct not only logically but in reality, since they are different both in terms of their origin and in terms of the relations which are involved.[189] Emanations exist in God because God exists as most perfect and fecund being, in whom are found the two perfect modes of production: that of nature and that of will.[190] But it is not sufficient to say that there are emanations; it is necessary to show how they differ from each other. For Bonaventure, this is done most adequately in terms of the differences in the point of origin and in the relations corresponding to each. Generation is from one Person, while spiration is from two. Hence, they differ in origin. The active generation of the Son in itself does not necessarily imply a third Person; active spiration, on the other hand, does, since the love of the Father and Son is directed to a third without whom it would not be perfect love; hence, the Spirit proceeds as that which can be given as gift.[191] In brief, the first emanation is *per modum naturae, concomitante voluntate*, while the second is *per modum voluntatis, concomitante natura.*

---

[188] *I Sent.* d. 10 (1, 194ff.) and *I Sent.* d. 32 (1, 555ff.). The question has been studied closely by Walter Principe, see note 104 above.

[189] *I Sent.* d. 13, au., q. 3, resp. (1, 235).

[190] *I Sent.* d. 13, a.u., q. 3, resp. (1, 236).

[191] *I Sent.* d. 13, a.u., q. 3, resp. (1, 236).

The Titles of the Third Person

The names which Bonaventure favors as designations of the third Person are: Love, Bond, Holy Spirit, and Gift, all of which help to express the relation of the third Person to the other divine Persons as well as to creation.[192]

Love

As we have seen above, the term *love* is to be understood in three ways: essential, notional, and personal.[193] The first refers to the divine essence itself, that love whereby the divine Persons love themselves and all of creation. The second refers to the concord of will between the Father and the Son, or their reciprocal love from which the Spirit emanates. It is called notional, to indicate that it is this love by which the second procession becomes known. As distinct from these two understandings of love, the Spirit is the hypostatic or personal love which proceeds from the perfect liberality of the divine, fecund will found in the Father and the Son. He who proceeds *per modum amoris* is himself *Amor.*

Bond

The meaning of this title is clear from the discussion in the preceding section. It signifies that the Father and the Son are most intimately joined in the common possession of the one fecundity of will and thus, though distinct as Persons, are but one principle in the emanation of the Spirit. The Spirit *joins* the Father and the Son in the sense that he proceeds from the concord of their will and from their perfect liberality.[194]

Holy Spirit

While the term spirit can be used in various ways and can be applied both to creature and to God, it has a particular relevance with respect to the third divine Person.[195] The act of breathing in our bodily life is a continuous, internal, life-giving act that arises from the warm depths within the body. It can, therefore, serve as an apt analogy for our understanding of the third Person as a spiration of love. Love proceeds from the warm

---

192 *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212).
193 *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1, 201).
194 *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (1, 202).
195 *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1, 204).

depths as a continuous, life-giving act; and since love is the form which human life should take, a human person is more perfect to the degree that that such love is realized. Thus, love appears as spiritual warmth, and only love is said to emanate spiritually.[196]

Accordingly, while at one level, the whole of the Trinity is called spiritual being since it lacks all materiality, at another level, the term spirit has a special appropriateness in reference to the third Person who proceeds as love from spiration, since in spiritual beings, spiration arises only from love. And since the love that is the Spirit is most pure, perfect, and ordinate, He is called not only Spirit, but Holy Spirit.[197]

Gift

The title *Gift* is deeply rooted in the Augustinian tradition and provides the basis for a rich theology of grace. As a title, it is proper to the Spirit,[198] expressing first of all his relation to the Father and the Son as the fruit of their mutual self-giving.[199] In that is contained the fact that it is the Gift in whom all gifts are bestowed on us, but not in the sense that every gift we receive includes an unfailing communication of the Spirit himself.[200] While it is possible that we may possess a created gift without thereby receiving the Spirit within ourselves, it is not possible that there should exist any created gifts whatever unless there were first the eternal Gift of the Spirit who is the *ratio donandi*.

The title can be understood also in terms of causality.[201] When causality is taken simply and with no further qualifications, the three Persons are not distinguished, since all gifts are given by all three equally. When causality is understood together with relations among the Persons, particularly with respect to sub-authority, the Spirit is distinguished from the Father, but not from the Son, since the Father confers all gifts through

---

196 *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1, 204).

197 *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1, 204). In as far as the terms *holy* and *pure* have particular relevance to the will's act of love rather than to an act of nature, they are not used to designate the natural generation of the Son.

198 *I Sent.* d. 18, au., q. 4, resp. (1, 328). Bonaventure distinguishes three levels of predication. 1) The whole of the Trinity may be said to give itself. This is an essential predication. 2) In as far as both the Son and the Spirit are sent, they can be said to be given. This is a personal predication. 3) In the proper sense, the Holy Spirit is said to be Gift, since the title expresses both his relation to the Father and the Son and his relation to creatures.

199 *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 212). He is Gift as the one who is given through the will.

200 *I Sent.* d. 18, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 323).

201 *I Sent.* d. 18, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 324).

the Son and through the Spirit. When causality is seen together with subauthority and exemplarity, the proper application to the Spirit emerges; as the first gift, he is the exemplary basis of all proper and free giving.[202]

It is with the spiration of the Holy Spirit that the Trinitarian circle of divine life is completed. Less than three Persons would be inadequate for the divine perfection, and more than three Persons would be superfluous. If there were to be more than three, there would have to be more than two perfect modes of emanation. Bonaventure rejects that possibility on the authority of Aristotle. The only other possibility would be to say that there is more than one Person proceeding from each of the modes of emanation. But this would be the same as saying that the products of the divine emanations are not perfect and adequate to the divine reality in every way; and that therefore the acts of production are imperfect. This would violate the basic concept of God as most perfect and fully actual being. But if the productive act is perfect, then the product of that act is the full and adequate expression of divine reality in one Person. There can be, therefore, only two perfect modes of emanation and hence only two emanating Persons. Any duplication is unnecessary and superfluous.[203] The circle of divine life is closed.

Missions and Appropriations

It is in the Trinitarian doctrine that conceives of God as supremely communicative being that Christian theology made a major departure from the metaphysical understanding of antiquity. While for Plato and for Aristotle, the first principle was never conceived as a creator in the strict sense of the word, it is precisely this that concerns Christian theology. Because theology conceived of God as immensely rich and communicative being within himself, it could readily move to the further, free communication of being which takes the form of the doctrine of creation, or the communication *ad extra*. Viewed in this way, the mystery of the created world appears as an external and free expression of the inner, spiritual fecundity of the divine being. For Bonaventure, as we have seen, this includes the conviction that the world reflects not only the divine nature as one, but

---

[202] *I Sent.* d. 18, au., q. 1, resp. (1, 324).

[203] *I Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 4 (1, 196); *Brev.* 1, 3 (5, 211); *Myst. Trin.* q. 4, a. 2, resp. (5, 85). Also, *I Sent.* d. 2, au., q. 4 (1, 56ff.) for the specific arguments which have already been discussed.

the divine nature as Trinitarian also. In its unity and in its rich diversity, the world is a symbol of that being in whom unity and multiplicity are united in a most perfect way. Although, in general terms, the whole of creation bears a relation to the Trinity, there are particular points in the history of the world at which the inner divine emanations become manifest with a peculiar clarity. This is the question of the divine missions in history.

The divine missions must be understood within the broader context of the scholastic doctrine of God's presence to the world "by essence, power, and presence."[204] Bonaventure, like his contemporaries generally, distinguishes various modes of divine presence. Of particular importance here is the distinction between God's universal presence to all of creation as its creative, sustaining, and perfecting cause, and the presence by means of indwelling, which refers specifically to spiritual creatures. Indwelling designates a spiritual effect in the rational creature together with the creature's acceptance of it, the result of which is the indwelling of the Trinity as a personal presence in the human person and the corresponding transformation of the human person into an ever more perfect similitude of the Trinity present to it.

Such an understanding of the indwelling of God directs our attention no longer to the structure of the created world as such, but more specifically to the history of grace which, for Bonaventure, also reveals a Trinitarian structure; for through this history, the mystery of the eternal emanations is made known to humankind in a particularly express way.[205] The technical term *mission* is used to designate the salvific activity of the Trinity whereby the distinction of persons is made known.

---

[204] *I Sent.* d. 37, p. 1, a. 3, q. 2, resp. (1, 648); *Brev.* 1, 5 (5, 213–214).

[205] The relation between the Trinity and the theology of history raises the question of yet another influence on Bonaventure's thought which was not treated above in the discussion of historical influences. It is the very complex and as yet unresolved question of the work of Joachim of Fiore. This issue was not mentioned above because it does not enter into the basic Trinitarian issues discussed there. But our understanding of the present issue must remain fragmentary until the as yet unresolved question of the influence of Joachim on Bonaenture has been studied more thoroughly. Ratzinger has singled out a number of points in which Bonaventure seems clearly under Joachim's influence although he rejected the Joachimite concept of the age of the Holy Spirit which stood in sharp contrast with Bonaventure's own Christo-centric vision. See Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 104ff., 117ff.; W. Schachten, "Die Trinitätslehre Bonaventuras als Explikation der Offenbarung vom personalen Gott," *Franziskanische Studien* 56 (1974): 191–214. Also see Bernard McGinn, "The Abbott and the Doctors: Scholastic Reactions to the Radical Eschatology of Joachim of Fiore," *Church History* 40 (1971): 30–47; and "The Significance of Bonaventure's Theology of History," *Journal of Religion* 58 (1978): 64–81.

The word *mission* involves two elements: emanation and manifestation.[206] Emanation refers to the eternal procession, while manifestation designates some historical effect generally perceptible to the senses and having an explicit revelatory meaning. Derived as it is from the Latin verb *mittere*, the substantive form *mission* (*missio*) may have either an active or a passive meaning. Its usage at this level reflects the active and passive dimensions of the eternal emanations, so that there is a positive correspondence between the emanations and the historical manifestations. Thus, we can move from the historical mission of one who is sent as Son to an awareness of the eternal procession of the Son from the Father, in which the possibility of the historical mission is grounded. Similarly, when the Spirit is known as the one sent by the Father and by the Son, we can move to an awareness of the eternal emanation of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son as described above. The most proper usage of the term *mission* is seen at this level, where the Person producing is said to send the Person produced. In a less proper though possible sense, one can say that the Persons send themselves, in as far as all possess the divine nature. But since the passive sense of *mission* always involves a passive emanation, it is theologically incorrect to say that either the Father or the whole of the Trinity sends itself.[207]

Mission, therefore, means that an eternal emanation has a temporal effect by which it becomes known in history. In the case of the Son, the entire doctrine of the incarnation is nothing but an extended treatment of the visible mission of the Son; and the visible mission of the Spirit from the Father and the Son is seen in the sending of the Spirit on the Church in the form of a dove or in tongues of fire. In both cases, the spatial imagery of descent is used, not to say that these persons leave heaven and come down to earth in a spatial sense, but to say that—while the emanations are eternal—the visible mission has a beginning in time.[208] The goal of

---

[206] *I Sent.* d. 15, p. 1, au., q. 3 (1, 263); *Brev.* 1, 5 (5, 213–214).

[207] *I Sent.* d. 15, p. 1, au., q. 3–4 (1, 263–266). This is based on the general principle that the direct meaning of mission is the historical manifestation, while its connotation is the eternal emanation. Whether in the active or passive form, the term implies some relation to a principle or source. Hence, it is used most properly when that relation is most clearly expressed. To say that the "Father sends the Son" is equivalent to saying that he manifests the emanation of the Son; to say that "the Son is sent" is equivalent to saying that in an historical effect it is made known that the Son emanates from another. Since the term *mission* always implies an emanation, it should never be applied to the Father nor to the Trinity as such, for neither of these can be said to emanate.

[208] *Brev.* 1, 5 (5, 213–214).

the visible missions is the internal mission, or the presence of God to the created spirit. This is developed theologically in the doctrine of grace.[209]

We find in Bonaventure's understanding of mission a consistent, logical expression of economic Trinitarianism. God communicates himself in history as he is in himself. There is, then, a positive correspondence between the economy of grace and the Trinitarian structure of God, because of which it is possible to come to a knowledge of the distinction of the Persons from the history of grace. The economy of a Trinitarian history is grounded ontologically in the immanent Trinitarian mystery of God himself.

Bonaventure's understanding of appropriation reveals from yet another perspective the same perception of the Trinity. Appropriation is a mode of predication whereby something which is common to all three Persons is predicated of one in particular. However, as Bonaventure warns, this should not be done in a haphazard way, or it will lose all significance and will ultimately confuse the entire question of the Trinity.

The primary purpose of appropriation is to facilitate our awareness of the individual divine Person in his personal mode of being. It can do this only if sufficient care is taken to search out and to clarify the particular relation between the essential attribute under consideration and the property of the particular Person to whom it is appropriated. This basic principle can be seen clearly in the three most basic appropriations.[210]

Power is appropriated to the Father. In itself, power is not a personal property but an essential attribute of the divine nature and, hence, common to the three Persons. Yet, it has a particular affinity to the property of the Father as sourceless Source. Therefore it can shed some light on the property of the Father.

Wisdom is appropriated to the Son. Scriptural evidence for such an appropriation is ambiguous, since 1 Cor. 12:8ff. seems to warrant an appropriation of wisdom to the Spirit. On the other hand, the liturgical tradition seems to attribute it commonly to the Word. For Bonaventure, the appropriation will be exclusively to the Word since, in a preeminent sense, he is divine truth. As the Father has expressed himself perfectly in his Word, the Word may be called the "expressed Wisdom of God." Since he

---

[209] *Brev.* 4, 1–10 (5, 241–252).

[210] *I Sent.* d. 34, au., q. 3, fm. 1–2; and resp. (1, 592). *Si autem loquamur quantum ad ordinem vel originem, quem connotant, sic appropriantur a parte rei propter convenientiam cum propriis personarum.*

contains in his personal reality the intelligibility of all things, the term *wisdom* is fittingly appropriated to him.[211]

Goodness is appropriated to the Spirit. This is based on Bonaventure's understanding of the emanation of the Spirit by liberality; this is the self-communication of God precisely as divine charity. But the charity by which the Father and Son breathe forth the Spirit is not essentially different from the love whereby God confers on creatures the gift of existence as well as the further gift of sharing in God's own love and beatitude. If both our existence as such and our graced existence are gift and goodness, is it not fitting to appropriate this to the one who is the uncreated Gift that proceeds from infinite Goodness?

These three cases indicate clearly the inner logic of appropriations as seen by Bonaventure. Beyond these, he draws up a more extensive series of appropriations which may be less clear, but still reflect the order of origin of the persons.[212]

Father	*Son*	*Spirit*
Unity	Truth	Goodness
Eternity	Beauty	Delight
Principle	Exemplar	End
Efficiency	Exemplarity	Finality
Power	Wisdom	Goodness

Such appropriations are important for Bonaventure, since he is convinced that all creatures exist, are sustained, and are brought to their completion by the threefold action of the Trinity. The search for such appropriations is the fitting response of the finite spirit to the mystery of the divine self-communication to the world.

Primacy in the Divine and Created Orders

With the concept of primacy (*primitas*), Bonaventure's approach to God in general and to the Trinity in particular finds its high-point. It is, indeed, a very personal development of the Seraphic Doctor and is found in this form in none of his predecessors. Yet, his unique contribution has a rather simple premise: by the mere fact that God is the first principle, God is

---

[211] *I Sent.* d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, resp. (1, 485).
[212] *Brev.* 1, 6 (5, 214–215); *Sermo de Trinitate* (9, 351–357).

necessarily a Trinity. For Bonaventure, philosophical reason and theological faith both lead to *primitas*, the origin and end of both.

Bonaventure employs the "logic of primacy" to explain both the mystery of the Trinity and the nature of God's relation to creatures. God is first, not only in the sense that His nature is prior to all created natures: the concept of primacy must be drawn into the very life of God where it finds its absolute roots in the person of the Father, who is source and origin of all within the divine order of the Godhead. The origin of all from the Father through the Son and Spirit, and the return of all to the Father through the Son and the Spirit, constitute the "intelligible circle" of created existence which, in its own way, reflects the "intelligible circle" that is the life of God.

As the absolutely first being, God is being in its fullness. This concept of God's being runs through all of Bonaventure's works. A lack or privation can be known only through the corresponding positive quality which is prior not only in the logical order, but in the real order as well. To the degree that something is prior, to the same degree it is more full of the positive qualities and perfections of being. Since God is absolutely prior to all else, he is the full actuality of being in all its necessary perfections.

From this, it follows that God is cause of others to the degree that he is first; for to be first is the same as to be principle.[213] To be principle with respect to the world is to be cause or source from which all emanates and to which all returns. The productive fecundity of God is in proportion to his primacy;[214] his absolute primacy, therefore, designates him as the universal fountain of all origin, or in Bonaventure's suggestive terms, the *fontalis plenitudo.* He is the absolute source and cause of all that exists within the created order.

Not only does primacy illumine God's nature as fountain of all created being, but—as Bonaventure argues—if God is eternal, then he is principle from eternity. But, since he is pure actuality in all that he is, he must be eternally productive as principle. But if we are not to be forced to conclude that the world is necessary and eternal, we must conclude that the primacy of God requires perfect, intrinsic production. We are, therefore, led into the realm of Trinitarianism. Primacy demands not only that God be cause of the world, but also that he be perfectly and eternally productive within himself; for if he is eternally first, he is eternally principle,

---

[213] *I Sent.* d. 28, a. 1, q. 2, ad 4 (1, 499). Also, in the present *Question,* fundament 1 (1, 499).
[214] *I Sent.* d. 2, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 4 (1, 53): *quanto aliquid prius tanto fecundius.*

most perfect, most actual and productive prior to the production of the world. Indeed, it is precisely because he is productive within that the production of the external world is possible; for the world is not equal with God, but the production of something unequal is necessarily posterior to the production of something equal. The necessary prior condition for the production of the world, therefore, is the eternal production of another who is fully equal with God. Primacy with respect to the created order, consequently, requires primacy within the divine order of God himself.

Thus far, we have seen the relation between primacy and production in God. The question of the productions may be further clarified through the basic movements of spiritual, intellectual beings which are active as principles through an inner word of knowledge and the intrinsic gift of love. Such a principle first conceives an inner word and breathes love within, before it produces an external effect. The analogy may be applied to God as a spiritual principle; before he can be productive externally, He must be productive internally in this twofold way. These two modes of intrinsic productivity may be further specified as productions *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis*, as clarified above. But these two immanent modes of production must have a proportionate term, which is found in the hypostatic Word and in the hypostatic Love. The divine fecundity, which lies most radically in the Father but is possessed in common by the three Persons with respect to creatures, is the fount from which flow the inner-divine emanations as well. Creation itself is but the radiation in space and time of the eternal inner-Trinitarian life.

Primacy, then, is the central Trinitarian concept for Bonaventure's system. That which is absolutely first is prior in all respects to that which is not first. Since creation is the production of that which is imperfect, lacking in unity, composed, finite in potency, temporal, changeable, lacking in actuality and necessity, such a production is necessarily posterior to a production which brings forth the perfect, supreme, undivided, simple, infinite, eternal, immutable, and necessary. In effect, the density and compactness of Bonaventure's thought is guided by a relatively small number of keenly perceived insights.

Primacy elucidates the relation of the Trinity to the mystery of the human person. For Bonaventure, it is not in the contemplation of an abstract, impersonal first principle that humans find rest and fulfillment, but only in the contemplation of that mystery of the most holy, personal God of goodness and love. As the Trinitarian life of God may be symbolized by a circle, so also human existence is a going-out from the triune God and a return to the same God after the manner of an intelligible circle

through memory, intelligence, and will. The human soul will find its full completion and its rest in that it becomes conformed to the triune God himself as a true similitude of the Trinitarian mystery which has stamped its creation with the indelible sign of its origin. And this is eternal life which flows from the eternal Fount of Life, sweeping like a great river through time and history and the spiritual development of humanity, and closing back on its point of origin. He is the Alpha and the Omega; the beginning and the end.

Hence, in its own proper reality, the order of creation is and remains a reflection of God. Bonaventure explicates the analogical correspondence between the divine and created orders via the symbol of a book: the book of nature/creation, the book of scripture, and the book of life. With the book of creation, every creature is a vestige of God and thus reflects God's Trinitarian reality in a distant and unclear way in terms of three series of attributes: measure, species, order; unity, truth, goodness; measure, number, weight. By reason of appropriations, one can recognize a distant reflection of the Trinity, but not a knowledge of the three Persons precisely as Persons. The witness of the vestige consists primarily in its witness to a three-fold causality: efficient, exemplary, and final. Bonaventure views the material world as a medium of communication between God and man; his interpretation of its structure, therefore, is of a theological nature. The created order is the objectification of the Absolute Being's Word. It is, therefore, a means whereby the Absolute can communicate itself to the finite human spirit. This is the structure of the world, both prior to the Fall and after the Fall.

There is yet a deeper level at which creation reflects God as triune within the book of creation; namely, in man who is created in the image of God. Bonaventure here employs the two Augustinian triads: mind—knowledge—love,[215] and, more significantly, memory—intelligence—will.[216] The analogy which he derives from these, and which he sees as an express and proximate witness, is that of origin and emanation leading to distinction. This corresponds fully with his understanding of the Father, as described above. The analogy of origin, together with equality, consubstantiality, and inseparability, constitutes an express testimony to the triune character of God.

---

[215] *I Sent.* d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1–2 (1, 80–87) and a. 2, q. 1–3 (1, 88–93).

[216] *I Sent.* d. 3, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1–3 (1, 80–87), *Brev.* 2, 9 (5, 226), *Itin.* 3 (5, 303–306).

This twofold witness of the created order (vestige—image) was clear and adequate prior to the Fall. But sin, with its attendant darkness, has made it difficult to read the book of creation. It is for this reason that the book of scripture became necessary.[217] But that which is revealed in the scriptures is not something contrary to the book of nature. Rather, the scriptures make it possible for humans to read and to interpret the divine revelation which has never been deficient nor absent from the beginning of the world to the end. The book of nature is not nullified, but is made legible again.[218]

The first two books of themselves are but inert realities unless they are read by human persons, for only then do they come to life in the finite spirit. They must be read in the proper light, which is found in what Bonaventure calls the *book of life.*[219] This term refers here to God's own inner life of knowledge in as far as it is the source of illumination for the human mind in reading both the book of nature and that of scripture. It is the conjunction of the innate light of the human mind and the infused light of supernatural faith that makes the proper reading of the two previous books possible. Thus, similitude or likeness is a third level of participation beyond vestige and image, which makes the created the image and express likeness of Christ, the perfect Image of the Trinity.

However, the book of life is not a source of knowledge independently of man's experience of the world and of history. Rather, it is the light whereby that experience may be read properly. Since illumination begins already in the innate light of the mind, and is brought to completion in the

---

[217] *Brev.* prol. (5, 201–208) presents an extended treatment of how the meaning of the created order is expressed in sacred scripture and in the reflection on it in theology.

[218] *Hex.* 2, 20 (5, 39–340); *Hex.* 13, 12 (5, 390); *Hex.* 13, 13 (5, 390).

[219] This term is found frequently in religious literature of various traditions. In the Bible, it is found in both the Old Testament (Ex. 32:32; Is. 4:3; Dan. 12:1), and in the New Testament (Lk. 10:20; Phil. 4:3; Rev. 3:5, 17:8, 20:12, 20:15), generally in an eschatological context. In later theological literature, the term is frequently given a Christological significance (e.g., St Bernard, *Sermo in die sancto Paschae*, ed. Jean Leclerq and Henri Rochais [Sancti Bernardi opera] 5 [Rome: 1968], 95–102; Hugh of St Victor, *De Arca Noe Morali* 2.8 [CCSL 176, 46–47]). The *Summa Fratris Alexandri* recognizes three meanings for the term: 1) the knowledge of God in as far as it is the exemplar of life; 2) the human nature of the Son of God, in as far as it is the most express example of the divine exemplar; 3) sacred scripture, in as far as it gives verbal witness to the exemplar (*Summa* I, n. 255, [347]). In Bonaventure, the term has a wide range of interrelated meanings, all of which point to God's full and perfect knowledge in which all things in the world are known and in which the mystery of predestination resides. See *Brev.* 1, 8 (5, 216); *Comm. Luc.* 10, 20, n. 34–35 (7, 263–264); *IV Sent.* d. 43, a. 2, q. 1–3 (4, 896–898); *Brev.* 7, 1 (5, 281); *Hex.* 12, 8 (5, 385); *Lig. vit.* 12, 46 (8, 84–85).

infused light, it follows that reason and faith are related to one another in a very positive manner.[220] Reason is subordinate to faith; but faith is the intrinsic perfection of reason. For if the task of reason is to know reality, and if reality is not fully known until it is known in Trinitarian terms, then the task of reason is realized only partially until it finds its completion in faith.[221] Similarly, it is the conjunction of the light of reason and the light of faith that provides the basis for the unity and coherence of theology.[222] Ultimately, philosophical reason and theological faith receive their *status* in the unbegotten primacy of the Godhead who is the source and consummation of all existence in both the divine and the created orders.

[220] *Myst. Trin.* q. 1, a. 2, dub. 7 and ad op. 7 (5, 53 and 57). Also *II Sent.* d. 18, a. 1, q. 2, ad 5 (2, 437), where Bonaventure distinguishes two ways of understanding nature. In the first sense, it refers to all that a thing is capable of being by reason of its natural origin. It is natural for creatures to become all that God wills them to become; they have a potency for perfect obedience to God's will. God never acts contrary to nature conceived in this sense. The second sense refers to the power in creatures whereby they run their ordinary course. When nature is thus understood, it is possible to say that God acts at times against nature and at times beyond nature. He acts in the first way when he produces something that is normally produced by secondary causes, the manner of production being entirely different. He acts in the second way when he produces something not found in nature, or something which nature by itself is not ordered to produce (e.g. incarnation, glorified bodies).

[221] *III Sent.* d. 24, a. 2, q. 2 (3, 520–521).

[222] John F. Quinn, *The Historical Constitution of St. Bonaventure's Philosophy* (Toronto: 1973), 498–499, 679.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE *BREVILOQUIUM*

Joshua Benson

This essay begins with a defining passage of Bonaventure's christology. The following citation comes from the *Breviloquium* (c. 1257). The work is a powerful, synthetic presentation of his theological vision at the culmination of his academic career at Paris. The text contains a prologue and seven parts. The fourth part, the middle of the text, treats the *medium* of all reality: the incarnate Word. As the following passage shows, the treatment of the incarnate Word in part four is rooted in the prior three parts of the text and forms the gateway to the remaining three parts.[1] The passage quoted below comes from the first chapter of the fourth part. It provides a glimpse into the themes of Bonaventure's christology and offers a key to understanding the christological structure of his theological vision in the *Breviloquium* specifically, and perhaps in his works more generally. The polished Parisian master states:

> Therefore, since God made all things powerfully, wisely and best or benevolently, it was fitting that he would repair them in such a way that could show forth his power, wisdom and benevolence. Now what is more powerful than to join extremes supremely distant in one person? What is more wise and fitting than that for the perfection of the whole universe the joining of the first and last should occur, that is, of the Word of God that is the *principium* of all things and of human nature which was the last (*ultima*) of all creatures? What is more benevolent than that the Lord take *the form of a slave* (Phil. 2:7) for the salvation of a slave?[2]

---

[1] See the list of parts and chapters at *Brev*. Prol. (5, 209–210).

[2] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241). "Quoniam ergo Deus omnia fecit potenter, sapienter et optime seu benevolenter, decuit, ut sic repararet, quod suam potentiam, sapientiam et benevolentiam ostenderet. Quid autem potentius quam coniungere extrema summe distantia in unam personam? Quid sapientius et congruentius quam quod ad perfectionem totius universi fieret coniunctio primi et ultimi, Verbi scilicet Dei, quod est omnium principium, et humanae naturae, quae fuit ultima omnium creaturarum? Quid benevolentius, quam quod Dominus propter servi salutem accipiat formam servi?" The translation is mine; I have consulted the translation of Dominic Monti, *Breviloquium* (Saint Bonaventure: 2005), 132–133. The reference to 4.1 refers to the part (4) and chapter number (1). I will employ this style of reference throughout the essay and note when I modify Monti's translation; or I will include the Latin within Monti's translation where I believe it is significant.

Below, we will further examine this passage in the context of part 4, ch. 1. Here it is important to grasp the broad meanings Bonaventure gives to the incarnation of the Word, that guide his reflections in part four and also guide the structure of the *Breviloquium* as a whole. Immediately, we can see that there is an intimate connection between God's actions in creation and incarnation: the God who acts powerfully, wisely and benevolently in the creation of all things, acts the same way in the restoration of all things in the incarnation. When we then focus on the order of Bonaventure's rhetorical questions, a cluster of themes emerges.

The first is that Bonaventure immediately attends to the union of natures effected by God's power. We can infer from this (and find it substantiated in the text) that the union of natures is the bedrock of all other christological statements. If we do not understand this union and the rules of speech surrounding it, we will not properly understand or speak about Christ when we attend to other facets of his person. Bonaventure's second question focuses on the union's wise design that completes the entire universe by joining the first and the last.[3] This important theme of cosmic completion is immediately balanced by the theme drawn out by the third question, the healing the incarnation provides. For though Bonaventure holds that humanity could have been saved by other means, it is only by God's benevolent taking on of our nature that we are perfectly restored.[4]

The incarnation's double meaning of cosmic completion and the healing of humanity stemming from the union of natures in Christ's person recurs throughout Bonaventure's treatment of the incarnate Word in the *Breviloquium*. These two meanings also emerge in the very structure of the text. As I shall explain in detail below, the treatment of the incarnate Word in part 4 is placed precisely so that it can demonstrate that the incarnate Word completes creation and is the foundation for our recreation in Christ. Likewise, the construction of part 4 itself is meant to mirror the source of the incarnate Word's comprehensive reach: the perfect

[3] Bonaventure had articulated this earlier in a work, *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*: "By similar reasoning, therefore, we come to the conclusion that the highest and noblest perfection cannot exist in this world unless that nature in which the seminal principles are present, and that nature in which the intellectual principles are present, and that nature in which the ideal principles are present are simultaneously brought together in the unity of one person, as was done in the incarnation of the Son of God." See *Red. art.* (5, 324); *On the Reduction of the Arts*, trans. Zachary Hayes (Saint Bonaventure: 1996), 57.

[4] See *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241), trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 131; and 4.1 (5, 241), trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 134.

union of natures. Structure and content fuse in the *Breviloquium*, as the incarnate Word functions not just as a theological datum to be treated, but as a datum that guides the treatment of theology.[5]

The richness of the *Breviloquium*'s christology has not before received concerted attention. Rather, it has often functioned as a point on the way between the long but early commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (1250–1252) and the late but unfinished *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* (1273). These two texts have rightly been the subject of much commentary. Bonaventure's only synthesis of theology, the harvest of his seasons as a student and Master at Paris, the well from which he would draw in his later works, has received far less focused discussion.[6] Of course, Bonaventure's christology could not be limited to even these three works. He treated christological matters during all the phases of his career and in nearly every literary medium available to him.[7] Yet the *Breviloquium*, because of the crucial time at which it was written in his career and the clear synthesis and powerful structure it provides, deserves to be considered as the

[5] This is indeed a facet of Bonaventure's understanding of theology as a science, which holds that Christ is the *totum integrale* of theology, which provides union and order for the science of theology (See *1 Sent.*, pro., q. 1, resp. [1, 7]). Bonaventure's understanding of theology as a science and his convictions about Christ as the one who completes creation and heals humanity because of the union of natures in his person fuse in the *Breviloquium*. This dimension of the *Breviloquium* would, however, take too long to explain here, and I hope to offer that explanation alongside of the discussion of the *Breviloquium*'s structure in a future publication.

[6] Exceptions to this general trend are Emmanuel Falque's study on God in the *Breviloquium*: *Saint Bonaventure et l'entrée de Dieu en théologie. La Somme théologie du Breviloquium* (*prologue et première partie*) (Paris: 2000); and Paula Jean Miller's examination of marriage in the *Breviloquium*: *Marriage: The Sacrament of Divine-Human Communion*, vol. 1: *A Commentary on St. Bonaventure's Breviloquium* (Quincy: 1996).

[7] For example, in his early commentary on Luke (begun in 1248), his commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (1250–1252) (especially bk. 3), his works as a master of theology, like the disputed questions on the knowledge of Christ (c. 1254) and his commentary on John (c. 1254); in his works as minister general, like the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* (1259), the *Legenda* on Francis (c. 1261), and his last and unfinished work, the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* (1273). One might likewise include many of Bonaventure's sermons produced at various stages of his career, like the famous *Christ the One Teacher of All*. Depending upon how broad a definition of christology one holds, Bonaventure's disputed questions on the mystery of the Trinity (c. 1254) might also be included as essential to his christology. On the christology in the *Commentary on John* see Thomas J. Herbst, *The Road to Union. Johannine Dimensions of Bonaventure's Christology* (Grottaferrata: 2005), and "The Passion as Paradoxical Exemplarism in Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of John," *Antonianum* 78 (2003): 209–248. On the christology in the *Legenda Maior*, see Noel Muscat, "Francesco esemplificazione della 'theologia crucis' di Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 52 (2005): 55–77.

center-piece of his thought. For these reasons, this essay will focus only on Bonaventure's christology as it emerges in the *Breviloquium*.

Since understanding the christology of the *Breviloquium* is significantly impacted by understanding the structure of the text, this essay will first describe the structure of the *Breviloquium* and the incarnate Word's role within it. Secondly, the essay will analyze the fourth part of the *Breviloquium*, which focuses on the incarnation of the Word. The marvel and difficulty of the *Breviloquium* remains that its textual structure is so interlaced with its content that the one seems to constantly inform the other. What emerges is a picture of Christ, ihe Incarnate Word who is the one unifying *medium* of reality, who (as the vignette above already indicates) completes the universe and restores humanity because of the union of natures in his person. The perfect union of natures in his person is the reason for his expansive unifying power—discovered in the content and structure of the text.

Although I hope this essay serves as a helpful introduction to Bonaventure's christology, there can be no replacement for a chronological and exhaustive study of his christology like the excellent work of Zachary Hayes: *Christ the Hidden Center*.[8] This essay is deeply indebted to Hayes' study and the European scholars who informed his text. The essay also benefits from the creative reading of Bonaventure's christology by Ewert Cousins, the explorations of Ilia Delio, and a host of other studies in christology.[9]

---

[8] Zachary Hayes, *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure* (1981; repr. Saint Bonaventure: 1992). Advances in Bonaventurian studies demand that certain dates be changed and certain thoughts be augmented, but Hayes' study remains basic and provides the enormous service of summarizing and adjudicating the largely German scholarship he engaged. Of those earlier German studies the most important is Alexander Gerken, *Theologie des Wortes. Das Verhältnis von Schöpfung und Inkarnation bei Bonaventura* (Düsseldorf: 1963). Gerken's work on the theme of the threefold word in Bonaventure was augmented by Pietro Maranesi, *Verbum Inspiratum. Chiave ermeneutica dell'Hexaëmeron di San Bonaventura* (Rome: 1996).

[9] Cousins is famous for the theme of the "coincidence of opposites" through which he reads Bonaventure's thought in general and his christology in particular. See Ewert Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites* (Chicago: 1978). See the review of Cousins by George Tavard that expresses reservations I share: "The Coincidence of Opposites: A Recent Interpretation of Bonaventure," *Theological Studies* 41.3 (1980): 576–584. Among many texts, these are representative of Delio's approach: "Revisiting the Franciscan Doctrine of Christ," *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 3–23; "Theology, Metaphysics, and the Centrality of Christ," *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 254–273; "Christology from Within," *Heythrop Journal* 48 (2007): 438–457. She has also contributed to understanding the intersection of christology and spirituality in her *Crucified Love: Bonaventure's Mysticism of the Crucified Christ* (Quincy: 1998). On the intersection of christology and spirituality, see also

The Structure of the *Breviloquium* and the Function of the Incarnate Word

In order to understand the structure of the *Breviloquium* and the function of Bonaventure's treatment of the incarnate Word within it, we must begin by surveying the text at its broadest level by simply viewing its seven parts. Second, we shall turn to the prologue and discover how it describes the structure of theology through the categories of *ortus-progressus/modus-status/fructus*. With these categories in view, we shall, third, adopt the prologue's terms as a way to describe the structure of the *Breviloquium* itself and understand how the seven parts of the *Breviloquium* function together and demonstrate the incarnate Word's unifying role in the text. This corresponds to the role the incarnate Word plays in reality. Fourth, we shall examine the structure of part 4 itself, which specifically treats the incarnation of the Word. The structure of part 4 displays the unity of natures in Christ's person that it treats.

We must begin our study of the *Breviloquium* by following Bonaventure's advice to *contuit* the chapters of the text—to step back and survey them in wide-angle view, so to speak—and discover the sweep of the whole.[10] The *Breviloquium* opens with a prologue that discusses the nature of theology and scripture and scriptural interpretation. The seven parts of the *Breviloquium* then follow:[11]

Part 1: the Trinity of God
Part 2: the creation of the world
Part 3: the corruption of sin
Part 4: the incarnation of the Word
Part 5: the grace of the Holy Spirit
Part 6: the medicine of the sacraments
Part 7: the completion of final judgment

Holding the chapters in broad view, we can detect a few important features. Though the topics and their overall pattern are common to many

---

Elizabeth Dreyer, *The Cross in Christian Tradition: From Paul to Bonaventure* (New York: 2000).

[10] See *Brev*. prol. (5, 208): "Ut autem sequentia clarius elucescant, titulos particulares capitulorum praemittere curavi, ad faciliorem memoriam et lucidiorem contuitum dicendorum, quae septem partitionibus et septuaginta duobus capitulis distinguuntur."

[11] See *Brev*. prol. (5, 210–211; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 23–26), where the titles of the chapters are listed.

summaries of theology produced during the middle ages, this arrangement is specific to Bonaventure.[12] First, we should note the division into precisely seven parts. Bonaventure had utilized a division into seven units before and would again, especially in the earlier disputed questions on the knowledge of Christ and the later *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*.[13] Notably, the division into seven units coincides with the meaning those texts communicate in their seventh movement. In both of the aforementioned texts, Bonaventure causes the seventh movement of the text to concern completion, silence, and sabbath rest.[14] Seven symbolically signals completion to the biblical mind, and Bonaventure utilizes the pattern in the *Breviloquium* so that the structural completion of the text's seven movements coincides with the content of the seventh movement, which considers the end of all things in final judgment.

---

[12] One could, for instance, make easy parallels between the flow of the broad topics treated in Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and the flow of the *Breviloquium*'s parts: part 1 of the *Breviloquium* corresponding to bk. 1 of the *Sentences*; parts 2 and 3 to bk. 2; parts 4 and 5 to bk. 3; parts 6 and 7 to book 4. This arrangement would have aided Bonaventure's readers, who were probably familiar with the Lombard, and yet its specific seven-part arrangement remains his own. Besides Peter Lombard's Sentences, a host of medieval texts would have impacted his own presentation of christology in the *Breviloquium*. The Sentence commentaries of his immediate contemporaries and masters would have impacted him, but these sources are largely unedited, such as the Sentence commentary of the Franciscan Odo Rigaldus. The Sentence commentary of Alexander of Hales is available, however: *Glossa in quatuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi* 4 vols (Quaracchi, 1951–1957). Likewise, a host of late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century material likely impacted him, which is only now being edited. Of great importance would have been the *Summa Fratris Alexandri*, a summa whose first three books were compiled by Alexander of Hales, John of La Rochelle and others during the second quarter of the thirteenth century. See the edition: *Summa Theologica* (Quaracchi, 1924–1979). Likewise, the many sources that influenced that composition, like William of Auxerre's *Summa Aurea*, ed. Jean Ribaillier, 7 vols. (Rome: 1980–1987). So too the works of the great Victorine masters, like Hugh of St. Victor in his *De Sacramentis* (PL 176): *Hugh of Saint Victor on the Sacraments of the Christian Faith*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Eugene: 2007); and the secular master Robert Grosseteste, *De cessatione legalium*, ed. Richard C. Dales and Edward B. King (Oxford: 1986): *Robert Grosseteste on the Cessation of the Laws*, trans. Stephen M. Hildebrand (Washington: 2012).

[13] On the structure of the disputed questions on Christ's knowledge see my "Structure and Meaning in St. Bonaventure's *Quaestiones Disputatae De Scientia Christi*," *Franciscan Studies* 62 (2004): 67–90. On the complex structure of the *Itinerarium*, see Jay M. Hammond, "Order in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*," Appendix to J.A. Wayne Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*, trans. Jay M. Hammond (Saint Bonaventure: 2001) 191–271. Something of this seven-part dimension could also be detected in the structure of the disputed questions on the mystery of the Trinity when read from a particular perspective, as I hope to detail in a future article.

[14] See the seventh chapter of the *Itin.* (5, 312–313) and the seventh disputed question *De sc. Chr.* (5, 37–43).

Bonaventure also uses a series of seven to emphasize the middle, the *medium*, of the text in a clear way.[15] Earlier in his commentaries on the *Sentences* and on the Gospel of John, Bonaventure defined a *medium* as something that unites or communicates with extremes.[16] As we can already see from the passage we reviewed above, this is precisely what the union of natures in Christ's person effects: the joining of extremes supremely distant. Bonaventure expresses this understanding of Christ's role as *medium* in the structure of the *Breviloquium* by placing the treatment of the incarnate Word at part 4, the precise middle of the text's seven parts, which also structurally joins the text's parts.

A more detailed elucidation of the *Breviloquium*'s structure expands these simple observations. This requires an examination of the categories Bonaventure utilizes in the prologue of the *Breviloquium* to describe the structure of scripture and theology. When these categories are then applied to the structure of the text, they help further reveal the role the incarnate Word plays in the structure of the text, which mirrors the role he plays in reality. Bonaventure relates in the prologue that sacred scripture, "which is called theology," has an *ortus, progressus*, and *status*.[17] These three terms describe the structure of sacred scripture, distinguish it from other disciplines, and indicate the way its study must be approached. First, Bonaventure relates that scripture's *ortus*, its source or foundation, lies in that it comes through "an inflowing of the Most Blessed Trinity," not through human reasoning.[18] Unlike other disciplines, then, scripture is a gift whose source lies in the Trinity. This entails that scripture must be understood by the Trinity's gift of faith, which Bonaventure defines as an explicit faith in Christ: "the lamp, the door, and even the foundation of all scripture."[19] Hence, understanding the scriptures, that is, theological understanding, begins with faith in Christ.

Second, Bonaventure describes scripture's *progressus* which lies in that it corresponds to the demands of human capacities. There are two aspects

---

[15] This is clearly the case with the *De sc. Chr*. See Benson, "Structure and Meaning."

[16] See *III Sent*., d. 19, art. 2, q. 2 resp. (3, 410) and *Comm. John.* (6, 259, §59). Each text discusses further ways to understand Christ as *medium* that are significant to the context of the text in question, but they do not alter the significance of this way of understanding the term.

[17] *Brev*., prol. (5, 201). Notably, Bonaventure uses these terms (or nearly identical ones) elsewhere in his corpus at significant moments. See *Perf. evang*. q. 1 (5, 22; the *ortus, modus, fructus* of exterior humiliation), *De don. Spir*., col. 1 (5, 457; the *ortus, usus, fructus* of grace), *Soliloquium*, prol. (8, 28; *ortus, obiectum, fructus* of mental discipline).

[18] *Brev*., prol. (5, 201; trans., Monti, *Breviloquium*, 1).

[19] *Brev*., prol. (5, 201; trans., Monti, *Breviloquium*, 2).

to scripture's *progressus*. First, the *progressus* emerges from *what* scripture gives humanity: the knowledge of all things insofar as that relates to salvation.[20] This immense body of knowledge stretches across creation in its breadth and time in its length, reaching heaven at its height and hell at its depth.[21] Second, scripture corresponds to human capacities in terms of *how* it communicates this knowledge. The plurality of scripture's meanings, arising from its Trinitarian source, engages human minds that are suited for such a multivalent object and addresses the different sorts of persons who encounter scripture reaching out for salvation, who would be lost if scripture communicated its promises and admonitions in a single way.[22] The *progressus* of scripture, then, has two aspects: it involves *what* God communicates to humanity and *how* God communicates it. Since the term *progressus* bears both these meanings, Bonaventure will often utilize the term *modus* to designate this middle movement in the *Breviloquium*.

Finally, the *status* or *fructus* of scripture lies in the "fullness of eternal happiness."[23] The fruit of scripture and theology is that human beings come to rest and to the enjoyment of eternal life with the Trinity, the source of all things. *Status* returns to *ortus*. Bonaventure often utilizes the term *fructus* for *status*, or uses the two words together. In those instances, the use of *fructus* together with the term *status* serves to make clear that *status* in these instances means completion, since Bonaventure will also use the term to mean a state.[24]

With these categories of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* defined, we can now see how these categories that describe the structure of scripture can shape our understanding of the structure of the *Breviloquium*'s seven parts and highlight the incarnate Word's role as *medium*. Initially, we can see that part 1 on the Trinity functions as the *ortus* of the entire text, much as the Trinity is described as the *ortus* of scripture itself in the prologue. We can also easily identify part 7, on final judgment, as the *status* of the entire work, as it will ultimately describe the "fullness of everlasting happiness": the *status* of scripture described in the prologue.

---

[20] *Brev*., prol. (5, 201; trans., Monti, *Breviloquium*, 3).

[21] See *Brev*., prol. (5, 201 and in more detail from 202–206; trans., Monti, *Breviloquium*, 3–4 and 5–16).

[22] *Brev.*, prol. (5, 202, 203 and 206; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 4, 7 and 15).

[23] *Brev*., prol. (5, 202; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 4).

[24] So in *Breviloquium* 4.8 Bonaventure treats "de passione Christi quantum ad statum patientis" (5, 248). In this chapter, *status* is never followed by *fructus*, since throughout the chapter it clearly means "state" and not "completion," as in the prologue when he uses *status* and *fructus* together (5, 202).

That part 7 functions in this way can be further discerned from the exact wording of its title: "de statu finalis iudicii," on the *status* of final judgment.[25] Parts 2 through 6 of the *Breviloquium* (creation, sin, incarnation, grace and sacraments) can then be identified as the *progressus* of things in time, since these parts involve much of what Bonaventure details as the *progressus* of scripture in the prologue: the knowledge of all things insofar as that relates to our salvation.

The *progressus* formed by parts 2 through 6 admits of further scrutiny. I suggest that the structure of this group of parts may also be understood through the triad of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus*. The key to understanding this unit of parts is that the incarnate Word plays a double role in this series, as both *fructus* and *ortus*. This double role of the incarnate Word in the structure of the text is consistent with the double meaning of the incarnation of the Word that we saw above: thanks to the union of natures in his person, he cosmically completes the universe and heals humanity.

As we attend to the structure of parts 2 through 6, we must first recall that the ultimate *ortus* of all things in the *Breviloquium* must remain the Triune God. Likewise, its ultimate *status* or *fructus* must remain final judgment. However, if we creatively apply the terms from the prologue to the *progressus* of all things in time described in parts 2 through 6, we can infer that part 2, on creation, forms the *ortus* of creation's temporal movement out from God. Part 3 describes the horrifying turn in the *progressus*, the *modus* that deformed creation: sin. Part 4, on the incarnation of the Word, brings these two movements to completion since, as we saw above, Bonaventure describes the incarnate Word in part four as the fulfillment of creation. Christ therefore functions as the *fructus* of creation's movement out from God—the *medium* in whom all things are brought to completion.

Part 4 brings parts 2 and 3 to fulfillment—to *fructus*. Part 4 also relates to parts 5 and 6, not as *fructus* of creation but as the *ortus* of our recreation, consistent with Bonaventure's description of the incarnate Word in part 4 that we glimpsed above. The more detailed examination below will show that the incarnate Word restores humanity to God and restores the acts of knowledge, love and imitation of God to humanity that form part of our restoration from sin.[26] These actions, which are understood in

[25] See Bonaventure's list of the *Breviloquium*'s contents *Brev.* prol. (5, 209–210 at 210a).
[26] See *Brev.* 4.1 (5, 241–242).

relationship to the incarnation, are further bolstered by the example of Christ's death and the completed pattern of his resurrection, ascension and sending of the Spirit, which forms the Christian in the theological virtues.[27] As the one who restores us to the Father, the incarnate Word is the foundation, the *ortus*, of humanity's re-creation through grace, just as he is at one and the same time the *fructus* of creation itself. When we understand part 4 to embrace these two meanings, consistent with the meaning the incarnate Word bears in reality, we can then see how part 5 on grace functions as the *modus* of our re-creation, which heals the *modus* of sin introduced into creation in part 3. Supporting this interpretation, Bonaventure describes the incarnation at the outset of part 5, on grace, as the "origin and wellspring (*origo et fons*) of every gratuitous gift."[28] Grace has its *ortus* in Christ. Part 6, on the sacraments, is then the *fructus* of the movement of re-creation flowing from the incarnate Word. At the outset of part six, Bonaventure explicitly calls Christ the *ortus* of the sacraments.[29] The sacraments may then be understood as the healing *fructus* of our re-creation, and have their source in Christ, the *ortus* of re-creation. The sacraments can also be understood to return to the *ortus* of the entire series of parts 2 through 6, the *ortus* of creation described in part 2. Part 6 suggests this structural movement, since it relates that "as sensible objects had been the occasion of the fall of the soul, they might also become the occasion of its rising."[30] The sacraments are thus the *fructus* of the movement of parts 2 through 6 and connect intelligibly to the *ortus* of creation and re-creation—the creation of the world and the incarnate Word.

We may now summarize our understanding of the descending layers of structural complexity in the *Breviloquium*. When viewed through the structure of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* that governs the structure of scripture itself, the *Breviloquium* can be understood to perform the meanings Bonaventure has ascribed to the incarnate Word in part 4. He is at one and the same time the completion of the universe, expressed structurally as the *fructus* of creation; and he offers healing to humanity, expressed structurally as the *ortus* of re-creation. The incarnate Word is expansively unifying in both the text and reality. He is that through which

---

[27] See *Brev.* 4.1 (5, 241–242), *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 249–250), and *Brev.* 4.10 (5, 250–252 respectively).

[28] *Brev*. 5.1 (5, 252; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 169). That *origo* and *fons* can relate to the term *ortus* seems clear enough from their meanings. Bonaventure allows for this interpretation when he calls Christ the *ortus* of the sacraments in *Brev.* 6.1 (5, 265) and then later their *principium et fons et origo* in 6.2 (5, 266).

[29] *Brev*. 6.1 (5, 265).

[30] See *Brev*. 6.1 (5, 265; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 212).

the world comes to be, comes to fulfillment, and humanity is healed; he is that through which these actions of the Triune God are communicated in scripture and expressed theologically. We may now graphically represent the structure of the *Breviloquium* through the following diagram:[31]

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Part 1:
The Trinity Ortus of all things</td><td rowspan="2">Part 2:
Creation
Ortus of
movement
from God</td><td rowspan="2">Part 3:
Sin
Modus
of fallen
creation</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="2">Part 4:
Christ
The one Medium</td><td rowspan="2">Part 5:
Grace
Modus of
re-creation</td><td rowspan="2">Part 6:
Sacraments
Fructus of
re-creation</td><td rowspan="2">Part 7:
Final Judgment Status of All Things</td></tr>
<tr></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>The</td><td>Progressus</td><td>Fructus
of
Creation</td><td>Ortus
of
Re-creation</td><td>All</td><td>Things</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

THE STRUCTURE OF *BREVILOQUIUM* PART 4

We must now probe the structure of the *Breviloquium* yet further. We can recall, from the snapshot of Bonaventure's christology reviewed above, that the expansively unifying power of the incarnate Word arises from the powerful union of the human and the divine in his person. The *Breviloquium* expresses this christological truth through the structural complexity of part 4 itself. For when we apply the same categories of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* to the treatment of the incarnate Word in part 4, we can see that the structure of this part comes into focus as a perfectly unified composition that mirrors the unity of the incarnate Word.

Bonaventure's treatment of the incarnation stretches across ten chapters in part 4. The first chapter, which we examined briefly above, concerns the reason for the incarnation and can be understood as a prologue to part 4. The next nine chapters (4.2–4.10) treat the incarnate Word himself. Bonaventure explicitly divides this series of chapters into three distinct groups of three chapters each.[32] This precise arrangement invites interpretation through the lens of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus*. The

[31] While this differs, note that Bonaventure structures the *Legenda major* in a similar manner by organizing the text according to the triple way of purgation, illumination and perfection on three levels: macro, intermediate, and micro; see Jay Hammond's essay in this collection for further explanation.

[32] See the opening of *Brev*. 4.2 (5, 242), which functions as a *divisio textus* for the rest of part 4.

first three chapters (*Brev*. 4.2–4.4) concern the union of natures. As we noted above, the union of natures forms the bedrock and guiding principle for all other christological assertions; it is that from which Bonaventure's understanding of Christ flows; it is therefore the *ortus* of Bonaventure's treatment of the incarnate Word.

The second series of three chapters (4.5–4.7) studies the gifts that mark the incarnate Word's presence among us: his grace, wisdom and merit. These gifts form the *modus* of Bonaventure's inquiry into the incarnate Word's person—as gifts through which the union of natures is manifested. The gifts also speak to what Christ does for humanity: he makes humanity one through his grace; his grace and wisdom "are the source of upright and holy living;"[33] his merit restores our relationship to God and opens the path to eternal life with God.[34]

Bonaventure's utilizes the third series of chapters (4.8–4.10) to examine the full scope of Christ's passion. The passion completes Bonaventure's inquiry in many ways, as it returns to *Brev.* 4.1 to clarify that the passion, more than any other action of Christ, demonstrates his unity with humanity as mediator (*Brev.* 4.8) and provides humanity with a perfect example of love to follow in love (*Brev.* 4.9). The examination also comes to completion with the passion, since the passion, in relationship to the resurrection, ascension and sending of the Spirit, fully and perfectly restores all things (*Brev*. 4.10). Further, the completed pattern of the mysteries following Christ's death, which Bonaventure literally calls the *fructus passionis*, forms the foundation for the following chapters on grace and the sacraments: the *fructus* of the passion forms the *ortus* of grace and the sacraments.[35]

Reviewing the distance we have come so far, we have seen that the triad of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* guides the *Breviloquium* at multiple levels. It shapes the broad structure of the entire text: part 1, on the Trinity, functions as the ultimate *ortus*, part 7, on final judgment, as the ultimate *status* and parts 2 through 6 as the *progressus* of all things in time. We then discerned that the unit of parts 2 through 6 is also shaped by these same terms, with the incarnation of the Word functioning as both *fructus* of creation and *ortus* of re-creation. As we have just seen, the same triad of terms from the prologue also shapes Bonaventure's treat-

[33] *Brev.* 4.7 (5, 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 155).
[34] See *Brev.* 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).
[35] See *Brev*. 4.10 (5, 250).

ment of the incarnation: the union of natures discussed in *Brev*. 4.2–4.4 forms the *ortus*, the fullness of gifts in *Brev*. 4.5–4.7 forms the *modus*, and the passion in *Brev*. 4.8–4.10 forms the *fructus*.

This triad continues to function at a yet deeper level that grants further unity to Bonaventure's treatment of the incarnate Word. Each of Bonaventure's inquiries into the person of the incarnate Word (on the union, gifts, and passion) consists of precisely three chapters that also invite further interpretation through the lens of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus*. The presence of this interpretive triad in each unit of three chapters can easily be seen by observing that the middle chapter of each unit of three chapters describes a *modus*. Thus, in *Brev*. 4.3 Bonaventure investigates "de modo incarnationis;" in *Brev*. 4.6 he considers the five "modi cognoscendi" in Christ; and in *Brev*. 4.9 he examines "de modo patiendi." Little interpretive effort is required to see that the opening and closing chapters of each set of three chapters can then function as *ortus* and *fructus* respectively. The effort adds to our understanding of Bonaventure's discussion of the incarnate Word and demonstrates how the text continues to display Bonaventure's christological convictions in the content and structure of the text: the union of natures in Christ is treated in such an utterly unified way because his union is the source of the unity he establishes in the text and reality.

Thus, within the unit of *Brev.* 4.2–4.4 that discusses the union of natures, *Brev*. 4.2 functions as the *ortus*, since it is the grammar of the union of natures that is the foundation for any further christological assertion. *Brev*. 4.3 functions as the *modus*, since it literally describes "de modo incarnationis." *Brev*. 4.4 completes the movement by discussing the point that the incarnation occurred in the fullness of time. The timing of the incarnation is crucial, since it occurs precisely at the moment when humanity was fully prepared to receive the incarnate Word. The incarnation also occurs at the moment in history which indicates *fullness*: "The coming of Christ occurred in the time of the law of grace, as a fulfillment of the promised mercy, and at the beginning of the sixth age. Each of these circumstances indicates a fullness."[36] *Brev*. 4.4 brings the investigation of the union of natures to *fructus* or *status*.

The same triad from the prologue guides the three chapters on Christ's gifts. *Brev*. 4.5, on Christ's grace, functions as the *ortus* of the investigation,

[36] *Brev*. 4.4 (5, 245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 145).

since the fullness of Christ's grace in particular may be understood as the source of his gifts in general. Further, the "fontal and original fullness" of grace in Christ causes his members to be one in him, and so his grace is the *ortus* of unity in the Church.[37] *Brev*. 4.6, in turn, specifically functions as the *modus* of the inquiry into the gifts, as it literally describes the modes of Christ's knowledge. As the *modus* of the gifts, we can reason that Christ's wisdom is the particular way by which he manifests the power of his gifts in general and his grace in particular, itself but a reflection of the union that is the ultimate source of his gifts. *Brev*. 4.7, which examines the merit of Christ, completes the series of chapters. The language of "fullness" marks every chapter on the gifts of the incarnate Word. What distinguishes the chapter on Christ's merit, however, is its reliance upon the previous discussion of Christ's grace, the *ortus* of the series of chapters on the gifts. The discussion of Christ's merit brings the discussion of the gifts to completion by returning to and further expanding the discussion of Christ's grace.

Finally, the triad of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* shapes the last series of three chapters on the passion of Christ. This examination begins with a discussion of the state of Christ in his suffering, which roots the treatment of the passion in Christ's full sharing of humanity and divinity. *Brev*. 4.8 thus reads as the *ortus* of Bonaventure's discussion of the passion. *Brev*. 4.9 forms the *modus*, as it literally describes the "mode of Christ's suffering."[38] Through Christ's suffering, God manifests his wisdom that heals humanity by reversing the fall and simultaneously provides an example through which we are led "to the height of virtue."[39] *Brev*. 4.10 completes the section by literally treating "de exitu passionis Christi et fructu." The ultimate fruits of the passion, Christ's resurrection, ascension and sending of the Spirit, bring human restoration to completion and establish the theological virtues that distinguish Christian life. The fourth part of the *Breviloquium* can therefore be represented graphically in the following way:

---

[37] See *Brev*. 4.5 (5, 246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 148–149).
[38] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 249).
[39] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 249–250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 161).

Ortus of Part 4:	The Union of Natures (4.2–4)	*Modus* of Part 4:	The Gifts of Christ (4.5–7)	*Fructus* of Part 4:	The passion of Christ (4.8–10)
Chapter:	Subject:	Chapter:	Subject:	Chapter:	Subject:
4.2: *Ortus*	Metaphysics of Union	4.5: *Ortus*	Grace	4.8: *Ortus*	The One Who Suffered
4.3: *Modus*	Annunciation	4.6: *Modus*	Wisdom	4.9: *Modus*	Manner of Suffering
4.4: *Fructus*	Fullness of Time	4.7: *Fructus*	Merit	4.10: *Fructus*	Fruits of the passion

The *Breviloquium*'s structural beauty provides a total vision of Christ that it executes in its organization. The incarnate Word who grants unity to the text and reality is discussed theologically in a unified way that reflects the union of natures in his person. The union in Christ is total and perfect, and Bonaventure discusses the incarnate Word in a manner that performs this perfect unity. The triad of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* guides the entire text at multiple levels, telescoping the action of the text to highlight the expansively unifying power of the powerfully united Christ: the one *Medium*, the true *Mediator*. With the structure of the text and the incarnate Word's role within it before our eyes, we can now turn to a focused examination of the content of part 4.

Analysis of Part 4, Ch. 1: The Reason for the Incarnation

Bonaventure's treatment of the incarnate Word in part 4 of the *Breviloquium* attempts to summarize what he believes the Christian theologian must know about the figure of the incarnate Word. As we have seen, he has carefully placed part 4 within the *Breviloquium* so that its structure and structural function in the text reflect what he understands to be true of the incarnate Word in reality. Our inquiry here shall simply proceed through the chapters of part 4 and analyze their content. The structural examination undertaken above is assumed, and I will only occasionally allude to it.

Part 4 begins by investigating the reason for the incarnation of the Word in ch. 1, which functions, as noted above, like a prologue to the entire fourth part. Bonaventure begins his inquiry, as he does in nearly every chapter of the *Breviloquium*, by simply asserting Christian belief,

which he then explains by first making reference to God.[40] Hence, in the first chapter of part 4, Bonaventure begins by frankly asserting that the salvation and redemption of the human race occurred through the incarnation of the Word, yet "this was not because God could not have saved and liberated the human race by some other means, but because no other way would have been so fitting or so appropriate to the Redeemer, those redeemed, and the nature of redemption."[41] The conclusion of this statement provides him with three distinct ways to approach the coherence of the incarnation: from the nature of God, the human person, and redemption itself.

Following the method he has adopted for each chapter of the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure begins his explanation of the incarnation by making reference to the nature of the God who acts in the incarnation. He wants to make clear from the outset that the actions of God in redemption are not less than his actions in creation: they are equivalent in dignity and operate by the same means. "Just as God had created all things through the uncreated Word," Bonaventure plainly asserts, "so he would restore all things through the incarnate Word."[42] Creation and redemption both occur through the Word. He then further describes the identity of God's actions in creation and redemption: "Therefore, since God made all things powerfully, wisely and best or benevolently, it was fitting that he would repair them in such a way that could show forth his power, wisdom and benevolence."[43] Bonaventure chooses his terms carefully in this passage. In part 1 of the *Breviloquium*, he addressed the topic of Trinitarian appropriations.[44] Bonaventure determined there that the appropriations of power,

---

[40] This is in accord with Bonaventure's basic purpose in the *Breviloquium* to explain that "the truth of Sacred Scripture is from God, treats of God, is according to God, and has God as its end" (*Brev*. prol. [5, 208; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 23]). I will not always follow Bonaventure's method to the letter, as first looking at his statement of Christian belief and then looking at his explanation could prove too tedious here.

[41] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 131).

[42] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 131–132).

[43] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 132 [modified]). "Quoniam ergo Deus omnia fecit potenter, sapienter et optime seu benevolenter; decuit, ut sic repareret, quod suam potentiam, sapientiam et benevolentiam ostenderet."

[44] *Brev*. 1.6 and then more fully with respect to power, wisdom and benevolence individually in *Brev* 1.7–1.9 (5, 214–218; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 44–57). The appropriations are attributes applicable to the whole Trinity but which may be restricted to a particular person to aid the understanding of the individual persons. For a concise treatment see Constant J. Mews, *Abelard and Heloise* (Oxford: 2005), 101–122. For a more in-depth study see Dominique Poirel, *Livre de la nature et débat trinitaire au XII^e siècle. Le De tribus diebus de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Bibliotheca Victorina) 14 (Turnhout: 2002), especially the third

wisdom and benevolence are especially important because scripture most often uses them to praise God.[45] Following this conviction, Bonaventure consistently utilizes these appropriations to describe God's actions in the *Breviloquium*.

"Now what is more powerful," Bonaventure rhetorically asks in *Brev.* 4.1, "than to join extremes supremely distant in one person? What is more wise and fitting," he continues, "than that for the perfection of the whole universe the joining of the first and that last should occur, that is of the Word of God (. . .) and human nature."[46] Finally, "What is more benevolent than that the Lord take the *form of a slave* for the salvation of a slave?"[47] As we saw above, the order of these rhetorical questions is important: they begin with admiration of the power God demonstrates in the union itself, which is the foundation for all other christological assertions, as the structure of part 4 indicates and the content of chapters 2 through 4 will show as we read them more closely below. The next two rhetorical questions then provide the two primary meanings of the incarnation we saw worked out in the structure of the text: the incarnation manifests God's wisdom because it completes creation, and manifests God's benevolence because it heals humanity. From the perspective of the God who acts in the incarnation, we can see that he makes all things perfect and whole in the union he effects by his marvelous power.

From the perspective of the human person, on the other hand, the incarnation primarily relates to healing from sin. When the human race fell into sin, Bonaventure relates, they definitively turned away from God's power, wisdom and benevolence which they had previously displayed as the consummation of God's works in creation.[48] Sin plunged humanity into the exact opposites: "they fell headlong into weakness, ignorance and malice."[49] The disorder of sin precisely undoes God's ordered act of

---

section on Trinitarian appropriations, 261–420; Poirel treats Bonaventure and the *Breviloquium* in particular, 409–412. See also Luc Mathieu, *La Trinité Créatrice d'après Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: 1992) who treats the appropriations, 59–109.

[45] *Brev*. 1.6 (5, 215; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 47).

[46] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 132 [modified]). "Quid autem potentius quam coniungere extrema summe distantia in unam personam? Quid sapientius et congruentius, quam quod ad perfectionem totius universi fieret coniunctio primi et ultimi, Verbi scilicet Dei, quod est omnium principium, et humanae naturae, quae fuit ultima omnium creaturarum?"

[47] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; see Monti, *Breviloquium*, 132–133 [modified]). "Quid benevolentius, quam quod Dominus propter servi salutem accipiat formam servi?"

[48] See *Brev.* 2.10 (5, 228; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 90–92).

[49] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 133).

creation. Due to sin, humanity that was once spiritual became carnal and "could no longer imitate divine virtue, know its light, or love its goodness."[50] Thus, *the Word became flesh* (Jn. 1:14) so that God "might be known and loved and imitated by human beings who were flesh."[51] Through these activities and their restorative effects, "humanity might be cured of the disease of sin."[52]

The incarnation of the Word restores humanity to proper human activities: knowing, loving and imitating God. The incarnation also restores humanity to its proper relationship with God. The last movement of *Brev.* 4.1 considers the incarnation of the Word from the perspective of redemption itself. Here Bonaventure describes how the incarnation restores three things to humanity: innocence of the mind, friendship with God, and proper excellence.[53] Each of these corresponds to a specific role of the incarnate Word. As a most excellent redeemer (*reparator*), the incarnate Word restores humanity to its proper excellence as subject only to God. This could occur, Bonaventure determines following Anselm, only if God were humanity's redeemer, "For if this redeemer had been a mere creature, then humanity would have become subject to another creature, and thus would not have regained its state of excellence."[54] The incarnate Word is also a most amicable mediator who alone can restore our friendship with God. By virtue of the union of natures, the incarnate Word can touch God with one hand and humanity with the other, reconciling both.[55] Finally, the incarnate Word as a most sufficient satisfier (*satisfactor*) also restores the innocence of our mind by making the satisfaction divine justice required. As Bonaventure relates in clearly Anselmian terms, only God could make this satisfaction, but only humanity needed to make it. Therefore, Bonaventure concludes, "it was most appropriate that humanity should be restored by a God-man, born of Adam's race."[56]

---

[50] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 133).

[51] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 133).

[52] *Brev*. 4.1 (V, p. 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, p. 133).

[53] These can be related to the triad of power (proper excellence), wisdom (innocence of mind), and benevolence (friendship with God) that guide Bonaventure's narrative, though he does not make this connection in the text.

[54] *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 134). See Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* 1.5 (Opera Omnia) 2, ed. Francis Schmitt (Edinburgh: 1946), 52; *Anselm of Canterbury. The Major Works*, trans. Brian Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford: 1998), 270.

[55] See *Brev*. 4.1 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 134).

[56] *Brev.* 4.1 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 134). See Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, 2.6 (Opera Omnia) 2, 101; trans. Davies and Evans, 319–320. For a recent examination of Anselm's christology see Daniel Deme, *The Christology of Anselm of Canterbury* (Aldershot:

In these three interrelated roles as satisfier, mediator and redeemer, God manifests his benevolence, "who takes on the form of a slave for the salvation of a slave."[57] Bonaventure suggests in another echo of Anselm that this is so great an act of kindness "that nothing more clement, nothing kinder, nothing more amicable could be thought."[58] This wonderful kindness on God's part not only restores humanity to itself; it restores the means to follow after the one who has accomplished this restoration. With respect to the human person, then, the incarnation of the Word has a double significance: the incarnate Word heals humanity's broken relationship with God and restores it to healing human activities. Similarly, from the perspective of the God who redeems, the incarnation of the Word also bears a twofold meaning that we saw worked out in the structure of the text: the healing of humanity and the completion of creation.

Analysis of Breviloquium Part 4, Ch. 2 Through 4: The Union

Having completed the investigation into the reason for the incarnation, Bonaventure now turns to the person of the incarnate Word himself. As we saw above, this inquiry ranges over the next nine chapters, which are divided into three distinct units of three chapters each: the union of natures (4.2–4.4), the fullness of gifts (4.5–4.7), and the passion (4.8–4.10). The examination of the person of the incarnate Word begins where it must, with the union itself in *Brev.* 4.2–4.4: the *ortus* of his investigation in part 4. Though Bonaventure begins with theological language that pertains to the incarnation, his investigation of the union considers dimensions of the incarnation that extend beyond theological language to the event of the incarnation itself. "Concerning the union of natures," he explains, "these three things must be considered in order to understand

---

2003). For a more condensed treatment of the argument in the *Cur Deus Homo* see G.R. Evans, *Saint Anselm of Canterbury* (London: 1989), 71–83. On Anselm generally, see Richard Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge: 1990). Bonaventure would have learned to use Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* from the masters of the early Franciscan school and their works. See Michael Robson, "The Impact of the *Cur Deus Homo* on the Early Franciscan School," in *Anselm. Aosta, Bec and Canterbury*, ed. D.E. Luscombe and G.R. Evans (Sheffield: 1996), 334–347.

[57] *Brev.* 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 134 [modified]).

[58] *Brev.* 4.1 (5, 241; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 133 [modified]). Bonaventure's "Immo hoc tantae benignitatis est, ut nihil clementius, nihil benignius, nihil amicabilius cogitari possit," echoes Anselm's famous "Et quidem credimus te esse aliquid quo nihil maius cogitari possit," from ch. 2 of the *Proslogion* (Opera Omnia) 1, 101.

the mystery of the incarnation: the work, the mode, the time."[59] These will be the subjects of the following three chapters.

Breviloquium 4.2 begins the investigation of the union by providing a series of foundational christological theses that establish a grammar of the union of natures. Bonaventure first states these theses and then provides the rationale for holding each one. The theses are explained in relationship to the God who acts in the incarnation as both creator and redeemer. He first affirms that the incarnation must be understood as a work of the whole Trinity. Bonaventure explicitly links this thesis to God as the effective principle or creator. Since the incarnation is an effect in the created world, it must be "a work of the First Principle, who accomplishes all things by virtue of its supreme power;" and in God, substance, power and operation "are absolutely united and completely undivided among the three persons."[60] For this reason, Bonaventure concludes that the incarnation of the Word cannot only be the work of the Word, but must be the work of the whole creative Trinity.

The remaining three theses relate to God as the reparative principle who performs three interrelated works in the incarnation. First, the incarnation flows from the reparative principle as a work of healing. This healing must be total. Therefore, "Since the human race had fallen into sin and was corrupted," Bonaventure explains, "not only in spirit but also in flesh, the whole nature had to be assumed so that all of it might be cured."[61] The incarnation's work of healing embraces the whole human person, body and soul. Second, the reparative principle performs the work of making satisfaction in the incarnation. "Now there is no satisfaction," Bonaventure demands, "except when made by one who ought to make it and can make it."[62] Recalling his Anselmian remarks from the first chapter of part 4, Bonaventure relates that only humanity needed to make satisfaction, but only God could make it. The human and divine must therefore come together to make satisfaction. Bonaventure rapidly evaluates and discards various ways by which the two natures can be united. He states his own position in compact and careful terms at the outset of *Brev*. 4.2: "the union does not occur in a unity of nature, but of person; not of a human person,

[59] *Brev.* 4.2 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 135 [modified]). "Circa naturarum unionem haec tria consideranda sunt ad intelligendum incarnationis mysterium, scilicet opus, modus et tempus."

[60] *Brev*. 4.2 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 136).

[61] *Brev*. 4.2 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 137).

[62] *Brev*. 4.2 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 137).

but of a divine one; not of the assumed person, but of the assuming one; and not of any person, but of the person of the Word alone."[63] Bonaventure further eschews any analogies for the union of natures based on the unity between a part and a whole or an accident and its substance.[64] All these carefully phrased denials and affirmations are meant to serve the core truth of the union of natures, that in the incarnation "there is but one person, and one personal unity."[65] This person is the Word who assumes humanity and who alone, by virtue of the union of natures, can accomplish the work of satisfaction.

Finally, the reparative principle performs the work of reconciling God to humanity in the incarnation. In this context, Bonaventure elaborates how the incarnate Word is the mediator between God and humanity. Bonaventure first clarifies that the mediator's role (echoing the first chapter of part 4) is "to be the medium between humanity and God in order to lead humankind back to divine knowledge, divine conformity, and divine sonship."[66] He then establishes that the Word is the most fitting *medium* for humanity because he is already the *medium* of the Trinity as "the person who both produces and is produced, the middle person of the three persons."[67] Bonaventure sees further correspondences between what the mediator must achieve to reconcile us to God and the person of the Word. Hence, the Word is best suited to restore divine knowledge because he is already the Word by which the Father expresses himself. The Word is likewise best suited to restore us to divine conformity because he is already the Father's image. He also restores us to divine sonship because he is the Father's natural Son. The *medium* of the Trinity is the *mediator* between

---

[63] Brev. 4.2 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 135–136 [modified]): "ita quod unio non fit in unitate naturae, sed personae, non humanae, sed divinae, non assumptae, sed assumentis, non personae cuiuslibet, sed personae solius Verbi."

[64] See the analysis by Richard Cross on Bonaventure's treatment of the metaphysics of the union in his *The Metaphysics of the Incarnation* (Oxford: 2002), 78–81. Cross acknowledges that Bonaventure "denies that there are any analogies for the hypostatic union," but his own analysis places Bonaventure in the category of "substance-accident" model (78).

[65] *Brev.* 4.2 (5, 242; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 138).

[66] *Brev.* 4.2 (5, 243; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 138).

[67] *Brev.* 4.2 (5, 243; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 138 [modified]). "Nullum atuem magis decet esse medium quam personam, quae producit et producitur, quae est media trium personarum." By "producing and produced," Bonaventure means that the Son produces the Spirit with the Father, but is also himself produced by the Father. By contrast, the Father only produces and is not produced by any person of the Trinity, and the Spirit is solely produced in the Trinity, though he produces in time. See *Brev.* 1.5 (5, 214; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 44).

God and humanity. He concludes the chapter by affirming the principle of the *communicatio idiomatum*.[68]

Having completed a grammar of the union of natures, Bonaventure continues to explore the union through an analysis of the event of the annunciation in *Brev.* 4.3 which describes the manner or *modus* of the incarnation as we saw above. Accordingly, Bonaventure clarifies three interrelated ways God repairs humanity in the incarnation: "The incarnation is a work that derives from the First Principle, insofar as it restores in a most appropriate, all-embracing (*communissimo*) and complete way."[69] The all-embracing way God acts in the incarnation evokes the double meaning of the incarnation Bonaventure articulated in *Breviloquium* 4.1, grounded in the unity of the one who is *medium* and *mediator* articulated in *Breviloquium* 4.2: the incarnation completes the universe and heals humanity.

Bonaventure first describes how God restores in the most appropriate way. This entails that God's wisdom heals the disease of sin with the correct medicine. Following his medieval heritage, in Bonaventure's view a medicine must precisely undo the disease. He therefore holds (in ancient Christian imagery) that the event of the annunciation precisely undoes the event of the Fall by reversing every aspect of the event of temptation and fall. The result of the annunciation also reverses the consequence of the fall. Through Eve we all receive sin, sickness and death. Through Mary we receive her son "who grants grace, health and life to all those who come to him."[70] The incarnate Word, the child who is for us, heals humanity.

Secondly, "the incarnation derives from the First Principle who redeems in an all-embracing way—for through the incarnate Word the fall of both humankind and the angels is repaired," and further, "the fall of human beings is repaired in both sexes."[71] Since the event of the incarnation affects all levels of reality, all levels of reality participate in the event.

---

[68] Defined precisely by Cross: "The schoolmen universally understand the communication of properties to be the ascription of divine and human properties to the divine person [the Word]." See *Metaphysics*, 183.

[69] *Brev.* 4.3 (5, 243; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 140).

[70] Bonaventure summarizes: "Since it was a woman deceived by Satan and carnally known and corrupted by her husband's lust, who passed on sin, sickness and death to all, so it was a woman, instructed by an angel and made holy and fruitful by the Holy Spirit, who gave birth to an offspring free from corruption of mind and body, who grants grace, health, and life to all those who come to him" (*Brev.* 4.3 [5, 243; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 140–141]).

[71] *Brev.* 4.3 (5, 243; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 141).

Hence the annunciation embraces all three hierarchies: the divine, the angelic and the human.[72] This one temporal event that brings healing to all reality, also brings all of reality into unity. This suggests that creation comes to a point of completion in the annunciation that it could not have reached in any other way. Bonaventure thus continues to affirm the double meaning of the incarnation of the Word he articulated in the first chapter of part four.

The final element of the explanation of the incarnation's mode places more explicit emphasis on the cosmic or completive dimension of the incarnation. The First Principle also redeems in a most complete way through his power.[73] Bonaventure here focuses on three aspects of Christ's conception: the offspring of the conception, the conception proper and the power involved in the conception. With respect to the conception proper, Bonaventure holds (again following Anselm) that there are four ways in which a human being can be conceived.[74] Until Mary's conception of Christ, the fourth way (conception by a woman without a man) had not occurred in the world and this in fact makes Mary a mother in the "most complete way."[75] Bonaventure underscores that this fourth way of conceiving occurs "for the completeness of the universe."[76] God's actions in history are excessive—he not only restores humanity, he completes creation itself.

Bonaventure now turns in *Breviloquium* 4.4 to the precise placement of the incarnate Word in history, which brings to fruition his discussion of the union of natures, the unity that is the *ortus* of his investigation of the person of the Incarnate Word. The placement of the incarnation in time refers back to how the incarnation of the Word corresponds to the human person in need of salvation and the God who saves in *Breviloquium* 4.1. Bonaventure clarifies in 4.4 that the incarnation takes place "in a manner consonant with free choice, the sublimity of the remedy and the completion

---

[72] The human hierarchy is represented by the Virgin and the humanity of her male son; the angelic hierarchy is represented by Gabriel; the divine hierarchy is represented fully because Gabriel is the herald of the Father, Mary is the temple of the Holy Spirit, and her Son is the Word (*Brev.* 4.3 [5, 243; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 141]).

[73] *Brev.* 4.3 (5, 43–244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 141–142).

[74] The four ways are: 1) neither from a man nor from a woman, as in Adam; 2) from a man without a woman, as in Eve; 3) from a man and a woman, as in all who are conceived with concupiscence; and 4) from a woman without a man, as in Christ. See Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* 2.8 (Opera Omnia) 2, 102–104); trans. Davies and Evans, 321–324.

[75] *Brev.* 4.3 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 142).

[76] *Brev.* 4.3 (V, p. 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, p. 142).

of the universe."[77] He first articulates how the time of the incarnation corresponds to free choice. It must occur when humanity was prepared to receive and make a free response to it.[78] After the fall, humanity was still arrogant about its power and knowledge. In order to recognize the need for a savior, humanity needed to be convinced of its ignorance and weakness. God therefore established the time of the natural law to convince humanity of its ignorance and the time of the written law to make clear its weakness. These periods show humanity their need for God, whom they call out for and receive in the incarnation of the Word.

Humanity should also desire the incarnation as a sublime remedy: "Such a sublime remedy had to be accepted with the strongest (*firmissima*) faith and cherished with the most ardent love as a deep (*secretissimum*) and life-giving mystery."[79] The prophets prepared humanity's desire for the incarnation through their explicit testimony in words and their implicit testimony in figures. Through those witnesses, the prophets prompted humanity to expect the coming of Christ, await it once expected, and more intensely desire it, the longer its fulfillment took.[80] For Bonaventure, the incarnation would only fittingly occur with humanity's ability to receive it and desire for it properly formed. If the incarnation had come too early, humanity would not have been convinced that they needed a redeemer, hence the periods of the natural and written law. Further, humanity would not have desired such a redeemer had it not understood its need for him and then waited with anticipation for him. The long period from the fall to the incarnation is a time of human preparation for the supremely life-giving mystery (*mysterium saluberrimum*) of the incarnation. The time of the incarnation therefore relates directly to human salvation.

The time of the incarnation also relates to the "integrity and perfection of the universe."[81] Bonaventure explains: "The coming of Christ occurred in the time of the law of grace, as a fulfillment of the promised mercy and at the beginning of the sixth age. Each of these circumstances indicates a fullness."[82] Fullness, Bonaventure reminds the reader, does not

[77] *Brev*. 4.4 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 143).

[78] For this and what follows, *Brev.* 4.4 (5, 244–245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 143–146).

[79] *Brev.* 4.4 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 144).

[80] *Brev.* 4.4 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 144). A medieval precedent for this theme of longing for the incarnation may be found in St Bernard's second sermon on the Song of Songs: *S. Bernardi Opera*, vol. 1, ed. J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot, H.M. Rochais (Rome: 1957), 8–14; *Song of Songs I*, trans. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo: 1971), 8–15.

[81] *Brev*. 4.4 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 145).

[82] *Brev*. 4.4 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 145).

indicate an end, but the time when all temporal mysteries are fulfilled. The moment of the incarnation is the fullness of time, metaphysically and historically: metaphysically, since the incarnation joins first and last; historically, since the incarnation ushers in the law of grace. As such, the incarnation fulfills all the preceding laws; it is the promise long expected and it occurs in the age which in its very number represents perfection and fullness.[83] As significant as the time of the incarnation is in underscoring how the incarnation completes the universe, its timing remains essential to human salvation for Bonaventure. The incarnation comes in the sixth age because humanity was then prepared to receive the mystery, having been convinced of its ignorance and weakness, but before the time of judgment: "so that moved by fear of judgment, urged on by hope of the reward, and inspired by a perfect example, we might follow our leader vigorously and perfectly *from virtue to virtue*, until we attain *the prize* of everlasting happiness."[84]

Bonaventure's examination of the union of natures provides a comprehensive view of the union itself and the unity the incarnate Word creates. Bonaventure affirms in different ways throughout the first four chapters of part 4 that the incarnate Word, by virtue of the union of natures in his person, heals humanity and completes creation. The incarnate Word is expansively unifying, as indicated by the content and structure of the text. It could not be otherwise, since the incarnation of the Word is an action of the Triune God who acts in both creation and redemption through his power, wisdom and benevolence. The God Bonaventure envisions restores all things completely through the Son. At the same time, Bonaventure insists that the incarnation of the Word relates directly to the human person in need of salvation. The Word's entrance into history is not destructive, but is carefully planned and prepared so that he may bring about the healing humanity requires in the most fitting way for humanity to receive it. The incarnation not only restores our broken relationship with God, but also restores humanity to the proper human activities of knowledge, love and imitation of God.

---

[83] *Brev*. 4.4 (5, 244; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 145). We recall here that in terms of the precise structure of part 4, this chapter functions as the *fructus* of the three chapters on the union, the *ortus* of Bonaventure's discussion of the person of the incarnate Word.

[84] *Brev*. 4.4 (5, p. 245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 146). Bonaventure is referencing Ps. 83:8 and Phil. 3:14 respectively in the italicized portions of the quote.

Analysis of Breviloquium Part 4, Chs. 5 Through 7: The Gifts

Bonaventure's examination of the union of natures in chapters 2 through 4 of part 4 formed the *ortus* for the investigation of the incarnate Word. He now turns his attention to the *modus*: the gifts the incarnate Word enjoys. The three chapters dedicated to this study (4.5–4.7) are meant to underscore the absolute fullness of gifts the incarnate Word possesses. Their fullness manifests the intense power of the union of natures and the expansive unity the incarnate Word creates, expressed (as we saw above) in the structure of the text. Bonaventure's treatment of these gifts begins with a discussion of the incarnate Word's grace in *Brev.* 4.5, which perfects his affect and is the *ortus* of his investigation of the gifts—that upon which all else in this specific series of three chapters stands. The examination is of crucial importance to Bonaventure because the whole process of repairing the human race is concerned with the activity of grace: "Since restoration is a work of the First Principle, flowing out from it with generosity and leading back to it through conformity, it is therefore fitting that this be accomplished through grace and conformity to God (*deiformitatem*)."[85]

Bonaventure discusses the fullness of Christ's grace in chapter 5 of part 4 under three headings: the grace of a particular person; the grace of headship; and the grace of union.[86] These three ways of speaking about grace are related to three ways of addressing the Iincarnate Word's role as reparative principle: the end (*extremum*) that makes satisfaction, the *medium* who reconciles, and the *principium* who influences.[87] As the end that makes satisfaction, Christ possesses the full grace of an individual person. This grace makes Christ totally sinless, by virtue of which he is totally pleasing to God and thus able to make satisfaction.[88] As the *medium* who reconciles, Christ possesses the full grace of union, since as medium between God and humanity he must possess both natures.[89] Since Christ possesses this grace, he is worthy of worship as both God and man. Finally, Christ is the *principium* whose influence reaches out to all his members. He thus possesses fully the grace of headship, uniting the whole mystical body of the just, past and present.[90] Christ is the fount of all grace, which clearly

[85] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, p. 245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 147).
[86] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 146–147).
[87] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 148).
[88] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 245; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 148).
[89] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 245–246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 148).
[90] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 148–149).

expresses the saving purpose and unitive power of the union of natures. The incarnate Word effects human redemption and makes the human race one in himself through the overflowing fullness of his grace. Bonaventure explicitly links Christ's grace to the sacramental bond he establishes in the Church, since all believers come to Christ "either through faith or the sacrament of faith."[91] The incarnate Word is the source of unity, the center of worship, the one who has reconciled humanity to the Father. His grace, flowing from the power of the union of natures in his person, embraces every facet of the healing humanity requires: restoring us to communion with God, each other and the activities proper to us. "Thus all the just," Bonaventure concludes the chapter, "wherever they might be, whenever they might live, constitute one mystical body of Christ, receiving sense and motion from the one head that influences them, through the fontal, radical and original fullness of all grace that dwells in Christ the fountainhead (*in Christo habitantis sicut in fonte*)."[92] The Church is union in Christ through Christ's overflowing grace. The expansive union Christ creates between believers past and present is but another consequence of the powerful union of natures that already unites all reality: facets we also saw realized in the structure of the text itself.

Bonaventure next turns to the incarnate Word's gift of wisdom.[93] "Just as the Principle of our restoration redeems us by a most generous grace," Bonaventure begins his explanation, "it also redeems by a most provident wisdom. For what was created according to the order of Wisdom cannot be restored except by the light and order of that same wisdom."[94] This wisdom cannot be lacking at all in Christ, just as he could not lack the fullness of grace. Thus, just as Christ is free from all sin, so Bonaventure believes that Christ is free from all ignorance.

Bonaventure distinguishes the fullness of Christ's wisdom into five different modes. All these divisions in Christ's knowledge follow familiar medieval paradigms, but Bonaventure has arranged them here with the *Breviloquium*'s usual clarity and brevity.[95] He develops these different

---

[91] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 149).

[92] *Brev.* 4.5 (5, 246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 149).

[93] Bonaventure tackled the problem of Christ's knowledge at length in at least three places throughout his career: the usual place, in commenting on the third book of *Sentences*, d. 14 (3, 295–326); his disputed questions *Sc. Chr.* (5, 3–43) and in the *Brev.* His remarks here consolidate his vision of this problem with remarkable brevity.

[94] *Brev.* 5.6 (5, 246); trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 150.

[95] On this topic in medieval theology generally, see Johannes Theodorus Ernst, *Die Lehre der hochmittelalterlichen Theologen von der vollkommenen Erkenntnis Christi. Ein*

modes by first distinguishing the ways in which things can exist and thus be an object of knowledge. "Since things have existence in the eternal art, in the human mind, and in their proper genus," Bonaventure explains, "Christ had to possess knowledge of them on these three levels." The eternal art can be known in two ways: "by the artisan himself and by the one contemplating the art."[96] This allows Bonaventure to distinguish two forms of knowledge in Christ: the knowledge he has according to his divine nature and that according to his glorified humanity. With respect to his divine nature, Christ has a knowledge of "all things, whether actual or possible, finite and infinite, with an actual and comprehensive knowledge."[97] In this mode, Christ knows the eternal art as its artist. Christ also knows the eternal art by contemplating it through his glorified humanity. In this mode, Christ has complete knowledge of all finite things, but not of infinite things, since the Word to which this knowledge is directed always exceeds the grasp even of Christ's glorified human intellect.[98]

How things have existence in the human mind allows Bonaventure to distinguish the two further modes of Christ's knowledge: "Likewise, things are and are known in two ways in the mind—even beyond acquisition, which is not applicable to Christ on account of imperfection—namely, either according to an innate habit or an infused habit."[99] Bonaventure treats these three forms of knowledge in reverse order. Thus in the third place Christ has a knowledge "by virtue of a gratuitous and infused habit, as did the saints of God illumined by the Holy Spirit."[100] Since grace is specifically linked to redemption, it is through this form of knowledge that "Christ knew everything that had to do with our redemption; and he knew it far better and more completely than did any prophet or even any of the angels."[101] The incarnate Word knows precisely how to redeem us

---

Versuch zur Auslegung der klassischen Dreiteilung: Visio Beata, Scientia Infusa und Scientia Acquisita (Freiburger Theologische Studien) (Freiburg: 1971), who treats Bonaventure at 144–169. See also Francisco Martínez Fresneda, *La Gracia y la Ciencia de Jesu Cristo: Historia de la cuestión en Alejandro de Hales, Odón Rigaldo, Summa Halensis y Buenaventura* (Murcia: 1997).

[96] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 151 [modified]). "Quia vero res dupliciter potest cognosci in arte, scilicet vel ab ipso artifice, vel ab alio contemplante artem."

[97] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 246; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 150).

[98] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 246 and 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 150 and 152).

[99] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 152 and 153).

[100] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 152).

[101] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 153).

because his wisdom is rooted in the grace he enjoys as the one fully united to the divine. Christ's knowledge by grace underscores the saving purpose of Christ's wisdom.

This saving knowledge through grace is balanced by the knowledge Christ has in the fourth place through an innate habit. Through this habit, the incarnate Word has the knowledge of an "integral" human nature (a complete human nature not tainted by sin) that allows him to understand "everything that has to do with the organization of the material universe much more fully than did Adam."[102] Finally, Christ has knowledge with respect to the senses, whereby he knows things in their proper genus. Whereas for us, knowledge acquired through the senses "makes something previously unknown to be known," for Christ it makes "a thing already known in one way to be known in another."[103] Christ advanced in this sort of knowledge during the course of his life as Bonaventure explains: "with respect to his sense knowledge Christ did not know everything simultaneously, but one thing at a time, insofar as these were opportune for him to achieve the redemption of human kind."[104] In this way, Bonaventure can affirm that Christ was never ignorant since he already knew all possible objects of sense, but he did grow in this specific mode of knowing. For Bonaventure, admitting Christ was ignorant would be the flip side of admitting that Christ had sin. Though humans experience ignorance and sin as part of daily reality, they are not constituents of human nature, but impediments to restoration with God and exercising the activities that befit the human race. Christ heals them through the grace that flows from the union of natures in his person.

Finally, Bonaventure completes his examination of Christ's gifts by drawing out the full implications of Christ's gift of grace as the foundation for Christ's merit in ch. 7 of part 4.[105] Christ's fullness of merit demonstrates the perfection of what Christ does, much as his grace and wisdom

[102] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 153. I detect a potential connection here between the way scripture is described as providing a knowledge that is *sublimis* (related to God the creator) and *salutaris* (related to Christ the Savior) in *Brev*. 2.5 (5, 222) and Christ's knowledge by integral nature and grace. Revelation provides the same forms of knowledge that are present within the knowledge of him who is the revelation of the Father.

[103] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, p. 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 152).

[104] *Brev*. 4.6 (5, 247; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 153).

[105] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 154).

demonstrated the perfection of his affect and intellect resulting from the union of natures. This inquiry is essential because by his merit we "are justified by grace, advance in righteousness, and are crowned with eternal glory."[106] The chapter underscores that Christ possesses a fullness of merit for himself and for us. Bonaventure draws out each aspect of Christ's fullness of merit in relationship to the distinctions he made with respect to Christ's grace earlier in *Breviloquium* 4.5.[107] In relationship to the grace of union, Christ merited fully because of who he was and the time when he began to merit: "Because in Christ dwelt the fullness of the grace of union, by which he was God from the first moment of his conception," for that reason, "there was in Christ the perfection of merit both because of the most excellent dignity of the one meriting it and because he began achieving it immediately (*quantum ad celerrimam opportunitatem temporis*)."[108] The grace of union entails that Christ's very presence among humanity is already saving.

Christ's merit is also complete with respect to that through which he obtained merit. This relates directly to the grace Christ possessed as an individual person. Christ possessed "the firmest charity and every perfect virtue."[109] Since Christ's merits were founded upon the "root of charity," his merit was perfect "with respect to that through which he achieved it."[110] His merit was also complete given whom he merited for, as it benefited not only himself but all humanity. This merit is tied to Christ's grace of headship by which he makes humanity one in himself. Bonaventure stresses that all goods whatsoever flow from Christ: all spiritual things that we have flow from the divinity, all the goods of this life and those of eternal happiness are merited by the humanity he assumed.[111]

Bonaventure also underscores that Christ's merit was perfect for himself. The fullness of the gifts of grace and wisdom Christ enjoys may suggest that there was nothing left for him to merit for himself. On the one hand, Bonaventure explains, "he did not merit the glory and blessedness which had been created together with his soul and existed in him naturally," but on the other hand, "he merited those things that do not coexist

---

[106] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).

[107] Thus, as we saw above, this final chapter on the gifts (the *fructus* of these three chapters) returns structurally to the *ortus* of this unit of chapters on the gifts.

[108] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 155).

[109] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 155).

[110] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).

[111] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 155).

with the state of a being a pilgrim here on earth," such as the glory of his body.[112]

Finally, much as Christ could not advance in knowledge in the same way as the rest of humanity, he could not advance in holiness at all: he merited all that he could from the first moment of his conception and was thus complete in the way he merited by meriting perfectly and instantaneously for himself.[113] He takes it upon himself freely, then, to merit for humanity. "It is in Christ's merit, then that all of our merits are rooted," Bonaventure offers in praise of Christ.[114] In him, all our hopes for salvation are grounded: "For we are unworthy to be absolved from any offense against the supreme Good, nor do we deserve to be rewarded with the immensity of the eternal reward that is God's own self, except through the merit of the God-man."[115]

Analysis of Breviloquium Part 4, Chs. 8 Through 10: The Passion

The power, wisdom and benevolence the Creator manifests for his fallen creation in the incarnation of the Word, in the gifts the incarnate Word manifests in his public ministry, at last reach their culmination as Bonaventure attends to the passion of the Christ—the *fructus* of his examination of the person of the Incarnate Word. He begins by considering the "condition of the one who suffered," in *Breviloquium* 4.8. The chapter presents a theology focused on the events at Gethsemane that extends to explain the suffering in Christ's life generally and the potential conflict in his will that the Gospels report of Gethsemane. Bonaventure attends to these problems by focusing on Christ's reconciling role as mediator between God and humanity. A mediator, on his definition, must "be in harmony with both extremes not only in regard to their natures but even with regard to what pertains to their natures."[116] Accordingly, "Christ assumed not only a human nature, but also the defects associated with it."[117]

---

[112] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).
[113] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).
[114] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).
[115] *Brev*. 4.7 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 156).
[116] *Brev*. 4.8 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 157 [modified]). "ideo necesse est, quod habeat convenientiam cum utroque extremorum non solum quantum ad naturam, verum etiam quantum ad ea quae sunt circa naturam." See also *III Sent.* d. 19, a. 2, q. 2 (3, 409–411) and the discussion by Justo L. Gonzalez, "The Work of Christ in Saint Bonaventure's Systematic Works," in *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974*, vol. 4 (Grottaferrata: 1974), 371–385.
[117] *Brev*. 4.8 (5, 248; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 157).

He is careful to explain that Christ does not share every defect of human nature. "It was necessary," Bonaventure clarifies, "that the mediator between God and humanity communicate with God in justice and beatitude, but with humanity in the capacity to suffer and die, so that he could lead humanity back to God."[118] Accordingly, Christ is perfectly innocent and does not share the corrupting penalties of original sin: "ignorance, bodily infirmity, malice and concupiscence."[119] Yet Christ can and does share in the punishments that "give occasion for the practice of perfect virtue and testify to a humanity that is genuine, not feigned (…) such as hunger and thirst in the absence of nourishment, and sorrow and fear in the presence of harm."[120] Christ's innocence and his unity with the divine further entail that he suffers no punishment unwillingly "according to reason."[121] However, sharing fully in human mortality, "he did suffer those things that were contrary to the natural impulses and tendencies that were part of his sensuality and flesh."[122] This discussion allows Bonaventure to explain to his satisfaction the apparent conflict in Christ's will at Gethsemane. When Christ said *Let this cup pass from me*, "he expressed the desire of his flesh to escape suffering"; yet, when he said *Not my will, but yours be done*, "he conformed his rational will to the will of the Father."[123] Bonaventure concludes that Christ's wills were perfectly ordered: "there was in Christ no struggle or resistance, but peaceful order and ordered tranquility."[124]

Though Christ's innocence prevents him from sharing in certain repercussions of the fall, it does not prevent him from being truly human, nor does it prevent him from sharing in human suffering and death. In

---

[118] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 48–249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 157–158 [modified]). Necesse fuit, mediatorem Dei et hominum, ut hominem posset reducere ad Deum, cum Deo communicare in iustitia et beatitudine, cum homine vero in passibilitate et mortatlitate." Bonaventure observes that Christ's position as mediator here is the reverse of the "evil angel's" role as mediator in sin. Christ has human mortality with divine justice and blessedness; the evil angel has immortality with misery and injustice.

[119] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 159).

[120] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 159).

[121] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 159).

[122] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 159).

[123] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 159). The scripture cited in italics in the quote derives from Mt. 26:39 and Lk. 22:42 respectively.

[124] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 160). A recent treatment of the problem of Christ's will in the middle ages is offered by Corey Barnes: *Christ's Two Wills in Scholastic Thought* (Toronto: 2012).

Bonaventure's eyes, his suffering and death are all the more powerful since this totally innocent man chooses them freely. The power of his choice to suffer and die for humanity is amplified by the intensity of how he suffers, which Bonaventure examines next in *Breviloquium* 4.9.

Bonaventure describes the breadth and depth of Christ's sufferings on the cross by explaining four ways he suffered: "most thorough, most bitter, most ignominious, a passion destructive yet life-giving."[125] The cross is not merely a vehicle for demonstrating the awesome torment of Christ's body and soul. Staying true to the principles of his examination of the incarnation in both structure and content, Bonaventure asserts that "As the restoring principle created the human race in an orderly fashion, so it was fitting that he restore it in an orderly manner."[126] This entails that "God ought to restore humanity in a way that preserves not only our free choice, but also God's own honor and the orderly functioning of the universe."[127] Christ's suffering on the cross therefore reflects Bonaventure's principle that God's actions in creation and redemption have a basic identity. As disruptive as the cross may be, it is but a part of the ordered plan of God's wisdom that acts in an orderly fashion in both creation and redemption—an orderly working reflected in the structure of the *Breviloquium* itself.

First, Bonaventure explains that the cross must be related to human free choice. In this context, Bonaventure shows that the cross provides humanity with "the most efficacious example" of virtue. "Nothing could show humankind the path to virtue more clearly," Bonaventure explains, "than the example of a death endured for the sake of divine justice and obedience;" a death that was additionally "the most painful (*poenalissimam*)."[128] The crucifixion therefore functions just as the incarnation had in *Breviloquium* 4.1: as God's way of leading humanity back to himself through knowledge, love and imitation. Knowing the full humiliation and torment of the innocent Christ who chose to suffer for us, "we are invited to love him, and in loving him, to follow his example (*imitandum*)."[129] The incarnation and crucifixion correspond to the human person in need of redemption.

---

[125] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 160).
[126] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 161).
[127] *Brev.* 4.8 (5, 249; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 161).
[128] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 161).
[129] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 161).

The crucifixion also relates to the honor due to God, much as the incarnation related to the nature of redemption itself in *Breviloquium* 4.1. Following Anselm, Bonaventure explains that "the honor which humankind was bound to pay God was taken away through pride and disobedience."[130] This could be restored in "no better way (. . .) than through humiliation and obedience by one who was not (*nullatenus*) bound to render it."[131] Christ, the *mediator* who is fully God and fully human, can alone make satisfaction for the honor stolen from God. The obedient death of this innocent man "restored to God through a fully satisfactory obedience that which he himself had not stolen, and thus offered for God's perfect appeasement a supremely pleasing sacrifice."[132]

This discussion provides the balance that Bonaventure has attempted to maintain throughout his examination of the incarnation: the incarnation (and here specifically, the crucifixion) restores humanity to God and restores humanity to the healing activities of knowledge, love, and imitation that lead us back to God. Both of these meanings take on further force when viewed from the perspective of how the crucifixion corresponds to the "orderly functioning of the universe." This discussion recalls the examination of the annunciation in *Breviloquium* 4.3. Much as the event of the annunciation precisely undid the event of the temptation and fall from Eve's perspective, so the crucifixion undoes the fall from Adam's perspective by healing through opposites.[133] Wishing to be as wise as God, Adam chose "to enjoy the fruit of the forbidden tree." God's wisdom reverses this event, as "God-made-human willed to be humiliated and to suffer on a tree."[134] Bonaventure now utilizes the four modes of Christ's suffering he identified at the beginning of the chapter to explain how the crucifixion undoes Adam's sin.

Adam's sin affected every human person and every part of the human person. Bonaventure clarifies: "So thorough was the corruption within us that it not only infected our body and soul in general, but penetrated every part of the body and all the powers of the soul."[135] In response,

---

[130] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 162).
[131] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 162).
[132] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 162).
[133] Though Bonaventure does not use this language, Mary clearly stands forth as the new Eve in *Brev.* 4.3 and Christ as the new Adam in *Brev.* 4.9.
[134] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 162).
[135] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 163).

Christ chose "a most thorough passion" that affected "every part of his body and every power of his soul, even in the highest part of his reason."[136] The ubiquity of humanity's infection in its members is matched by the ubiquity of Christ's passion in his.

Bonaventure also explains that Adam's sin resulted from his lust and pride. In response to Adam's lust and the lust that "so strongly infects our soul and body (…) Christ suffered not only the cruelest physical pain, but also the most acute mental torment."[137] Christ's physical and mental anguish was "immeasurable" because his perfect body and soul enabled him to experience fully the physical and spiritual torment of the cross. His passion is therefore "most bitter." The very nature of the cross as a punishment for criminals and the thieves at Christ's side, by contrast, undid our pride, since it was "a most ignominious" death.

Adam's perverted grasp at wisdom resulted in "forfeiting immorality and incurring inevitable death."[138] God's wisdom undoes this consequence through Christ's "destructive, yet life-giving" death. Christ's death can restore humanity to life precisely because of the union of natures in his person. "Hence, in Christ's death," Bonaventure offers "the separation of the soul from the flesh happened in such a way that the unity of the person and the union of the both the flesh and the soul with the Godhead was nevertheless preserved."[139] Since Christ's soul was really separated from his body, he truly died. However, "death in Christ's human nature could not bring death to the person who never ceases to live; for that reason death died in life."[140] The precise metaphysics of the incarnation causes death to die in the death of Christ, through whom "*death has been swallowed up in victory* and the Prince of Death has been vanquished."[141]

As the chapter concludes on the note of Christ's victorious death, it transitions to the final chapter in Bonaventure's consideration of the Incarnation of the Word in general and the passion in particular: "on the effect and fruit of Christ's passion." The theology centered on the events of Gethsemane in *Brev*. 4.8 and Golgotha in *Brev.* 4.9 gives way to a theology

---

[136] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 163).

[137] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 163). The Latin is elegant here and difficult to render: "hinc est, quod Christus et acerbissima passione passus est in carne et amarissima compassus est in anima."

[138] *Brev.* 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 162).

[139] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 250; translation mine).

[140] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 164).

[141] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 250; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 164). The scripture cited is 1 Cor. 15:54.

of cosmic victory in *Brev*. 4.10. This chapter is the ultimate *fructus* of Bonaventure's investigation of the incarnate Word and also establishes Christ further as the *ortus* of the life of grace that Bonaventure will examine in part 5, as the structural examination above described. Christ's victory is truly cosmic, reaching heaven, hell and earth; the past and the present. Bonaventure begins his explanation of Christ's comprehensive victory by recalling the theme he has underscored throughout part 4: "Just as Christ, insofar as he was the uncreated Word, had formed (*formavit*) all things most perfectly, so it was most fitting that Christ as the Word incarnate should most perfectly restore (*reformare*) all things."[142] Creation and redemption are both actions of the one God who acts through his Word. The perfect restoration of all things by the Word will entail that the restoration is completely sufficient and completely efficacious.

As a most sufficient restoration, the fruit of Christ's passion has a cosmic embrace, affecting all his members in terms of place: "Through Christ, those in the nether world were released, those on earth restored, and those in heaven replenished."[143] These acts are accomplished respectively by Christ's descent into hell, the resurrection, and the ascension. Christ then sends the Spirit "to build the earthly Jerusalem." The victory Christ wins is accomplished not just by the resurrection but by the completed pattern of the whole series of acts.

The complex of Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost also corresponds to the totally efficacious restoration made by Christ's passion. Here, Bonaventure underscores that the fruit of Christ's passion affects all his members in time. First, Christ's death affected all those who preceded his coming but still adhered to him as his members through faith, hope, and love. He liberates them first in the descent into hell. Bonaventure then explains how each detail of the resurrection, ascension, and Pentecost respectively forms the faith, hope, and charity of the members who followed his coming and ultimately constitute the church.

First, Christ establishes Christian faith upon the resurrection. The resurrection affirms that "he is truly human and truly God (. . .) that he has willed to redeem us through his death and is able to lead us back to life through his resurrection."[144] Bonaventure finds significance in what he

[142] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 251; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 165).
[143] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 251; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 165).
[144] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 251; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 166).

believes is the precise thirty-six hour interval of Christ's death. This demonstrates that he was truly dead but also had the power to raise himself. The ascension then establishes Christian hope, as "he rose to that heavenly glory to which we aspire."[145] Bonaventure takes care to articulate that Christian hope remains rooted in Christian faith. Thus, Christ "did not ascend at once, but allowed a period of forty days to pass during which, through many signs and proofs, he demonstrated that he had truly risen."[146] The hope of the ascension only rises from the foundation of faith in the resurrection. Finally, Christ sends the Spirit at Pentecost to inform Christian charity. He did not send the Spirit immediately after the ascension, but ten days later, so that the disciples could prepare themselves for the Spirit "through fasting, prayers and sighs."[147] Each event of this completed pattern of resurrection, ascension, and Pentecost helps form Christ's mystical body, laying a foundation for the virtues that form each believer in the total Easter story, known in the scriptures and performed in the church's liturgy. The Spirit, "who is Love and is possessed by love," however, is the one who as "the source of all spiritual gifts" brings "the mystical body of Christ to completion."[148] The paschal mystery is the foundation for the pneumatological mystery of the church, the body of Christ itself, the mystery Bonaventure continues to explore throughout parts 5 and 6 of the *Breviloquium*, on grace and the sacraments.[149] Thus, just as *Breviloquium* 4.1 demonstrated the how the early parts of the *Breviloquium* formed a foundation for Bonaventure's christology which brought them to *fructus, Brev.* 4.10 demonstrates how Bonaventure's christology forms a foundation—is the *ortus*—for the final parts of the text.

Conclusion

After such an exhausting tour of so rich a text, I now offer a brief summary of the christology of the *Breviloquium* and point in the direction

---

[145] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 251; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 167).
[146] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 251; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 166).
[147] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 251; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 167).
[148] *Brev*. 4.9 (5, 252; trans. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 168).
[149] Throughout the rest of the *Breviloquium*, the incarnate Word is linked to both grace and the sacraments as their font and origin. Thus, in the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure's understanding of grace, sacraments, and ultimately ecclesiology remain particular extensions of his christology.

of the other works this text did not cover, particularly the later works of Bonaventure's career as minister general. The *Breviloquium* presents the incarnate Word in both the structure and content of the text as the expansively unifying and powerfully unified *medium* of all reality. In him, the divine and human, the created and the uncreated are united in one person. The union in his person is the root of the incarnate Word's expansively unifying power: he both restores humanity to God and completes the universe. Bonaventure maintains this twofold meaning of the incarnation throughout part 4 of the *Breviloquium*, which corresponds to Bonaventure's understanding of the God who acts in creation and re-creation. Bonaventure also maintains a twofold meaning for the incarnation with respect to the human person who needs redemption. The incarnate Word restores humanity to God and restores humanity to knowledge, love, and imitation of God in the incarnation and passion. Created through the Word, humanity is re-created through the Word. Christ willingly suffered for this re-creation, stretching out his arms for those who fell into the nothingness of sin, much as he stretched out his power to bring all things out of nothing. He empties himself, beckons us to follow him, makes us one body through his grace, and establishes the ground of Christian life through the completed pattern of the Easter mysteries. It is a beautiful vision, rooted in the tradition that precedes him and rooted in his own convictions about the very nature of Christian theology, which must incorporate, as one of its key structural principles, the union of and unity created by the incarnate Word.

As comprehensive as the vision of Christ is that emerges in the *Breviloquium*, new insights emerged as Bonaventure's career as minister general advanced and he carried on a writing program reliant upon his deep theological formation but geared at new audiences, some academic, some not. What emerges in this period, it seems clear, is a more concerted focus upon the mystery of the crucified Christ, no doubt inspired by his reflections on the presence of the crucified in the founding saint of the order he now governed: Francis of Assisi and the great mystery of his stigmata. In the *Journey of the mind into God*, in the *Legenda Maior*, and in the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, the presence of the Crucified works its way into the structure and content of Bonaventure's work in ways that indicate a difference from the earlier *Breviloquium*. To be sure, as we saw, the *Breviloquium*'s analysis of the person of the Incarnate Word reaches its point of *fructus* in the discussion of the passion. Yet the passion and its related complex of Easter mysteries are always on the hori-

zon of Bonaventure's view in the *Breviloquium*. Ever in the foreground is the mystery of the one who is the *medium*—who unites and completes through the union itself, though to be sure, also through the blood of his cross and the Easter mysteries. His focus on the *medium* guides his presentation at all levels in the *Breviloquium*.

In the *Journey of the Mind into God*, we detect that the presence of the Crucified, mediated by his own meditations upon Francis's stigmata, works its way into the foreground of his thinking. Thus, the entrance to the seven stages of the *Itinerarium*'s ascent to God begins with "most ardent love the crucified" that transformed Paul and Francis.[150] Likewise, in ch. 6 of the *Itinerarium*, the peaceful contemplation of the essential attributes and persons in God is interrupted, so to speak, by the incarnation and passion, as the reader who has been instructed to gaze like the cherubim seated upon the ark of the covenant is instructed now to turn to the mercy seat itself and behold Christ.[151] Then in the work's final chapter, the reader is admonished to follow the crucified Christ out of this world to the Father, spurred on by a host of images of the crucified Christ, who thus is the means in and out of the journey.[152] Though this focus on the Crucified could be explained by the genre of the text, I am more inclined to think that the focus on the Crucified came by way of his reflections on Francis, which began to force the Crucified into the foreground of his thinking. Still, during the same period as he produced the *Itinerarium*, Bonaventure offered explanations of the mind's movement to God that did not carry an overt focus, or any focus at all, on the Crucified, such as in the *The triple way* and the *Five Feasts of the Child Jesus*.[153]

The *Legenda Maior*, on the other hand, is dominated from beginning to end by the presence of the crucified Christ, as the mystery of Francis's stigmata continually shapes Bonaventure's portrayal of the life of Francis.[154] Likewise, the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit* offer another compelling case that thinking about the Crucified had entered

---

[150] *Itin.* prol. (5, 295).
[151] *Itin.* 6 (5, 311).
[152] *Itin.* 7 (5, 312–313).
[153] See *Trip. Via* (8, 3–27) and *De quin. fest.* (8, 88–98). The *Trip. via* is translated in *Writings on the Spiritual Life*, ed. Edward Coughlin (Saint Bonaventure: 2006), 81–133. *De quin. fest.* is translated in *Bonaventure. Mystic of God's Word*, ed. Timothy Johnson (Hyde Park: 1999), 139–151.
[154] See *Leg. maj.* (5, 504–564).

more deeply into the foreground of Bonaventure's thought. The famous triad of the "threefold Word" (uncreated, incarnate, and inspired) that Bonaventure first noted in *Breviloquium* 4.1 is reconfigured as a new aspect is added—the crucified Word to help explain the mystery of grace in the first collation.[155]

Bonaventure's final work, perhaps by way of contrast, returns powerfully to the theme of Christ the *medium*. Jay Hammond notes that though this work is often noted for its polemical context, it is primarily a text designed to teach the audience how to read the scriptures contemplatively.[156] From the outset, Bonaventure's intention in the work is to show that "in Christ are hidden all the treasures of God's wisdom and knowledge, and that he himself is the center of all knowledge."[157] Collations 1 and 3 are significant here, as in the first Bonaventure defines Christ as the center of seven branches of knowledge which are aligned with seven mysteries of Christ, and in the third he returns to the theme of the threefold Word (without the crucified Word, this time) to describe the threefold Word as the "contemplative key who gives the fullness of knowledge, understanding and wisdom."[158]

Whatever the genres he employed, whatever the context in which he wrote, Bonaventure's christology ultimately centers upon Christ and the transformation he effects in us. He has completed all things. He has healed us. He has opened the gates. In Bonaventure's view, which expresses

---

[155] See *De don. Spir*. col. 1 (5, 458). The text is translated by Zachary Hayes: *Collations on the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit* (Saint Bonaventure: 2008). The various textual problems of the Quaracchi edition should be noted, as described by Jacqueline Hamesse, "La Deuxième Reportation des 'Collationes de Septem Donis Spiritus Sancti' de Saint Bonaventure," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 19 (1977): 59–64; eadem, "La prédication universitaire: éloquence sacrée, éloquence profane?" *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 105 (1991): 283–300. On the *verbum crucifixum*, see Pietro Maranesi, "Il Verbum Crucifixum: Un termine risolutivo della 'Theolgoia Crucis' di S. Bonaventura?" *Doctor Seraphicus* 52 (2005): 79–113.

[156] Jay Hammond, "Contemplation and the Formation of the Vir Spiritualis in Bonaventure's Collationes in Hexameron," in *Franciscans at Prayer*, ed. Timothy J. Johnson (Leiden, 2007), 123–165 at 124.

[157] *Hex*., col. 1 (5, 331). The text is translated by José de Vinck, *Collations on the Six Days* (Patterson: 1970). Hammond helpfully diagrams the branches of knowledge and Christ's role in them (133). The *Hex*. can be found in two editions: *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5 (Quaracchi: 1891), 329–454, and *Collationes in Hexaëmeron et Bonaventuriana Quaedam Selecta*, ed. Ferdinand Delorme (Quaracchi: 1934). The third collation has been transcribed from the important Petersburg manuscript. See Pietro Maranesi, "Bonaventure of Bagnoregio: A Transcription of the Third Collation of the Hexaëmeron from the St. Petersburg Manuscript," *Franciscan Studies* 53 (1993): 47–78. The key study on the *Hex*. is Maranesi, *Verbum Inspiratum*.

[158] Hammond, "Contemplation and the Formation of the *Vir Spiritualis*," 153.

so well the beauty of medieval thinking about Christ, Christians now live through his grace and are united in the church that is his body. In this body, Christians are founded and fed upon the mysteries that crown his presence among us and delivered us from sin and death. Here, we await in hope the day when we shall see him face to face, to contemplate eternally the one who by his powerful word of wisdom benevolently created and re-created us.

BONAVENTURE'S ANGELOLOGY

David Keck

Thirteenth-century Europe was filled with angels, and Bonaventure deeply desired to understand as much as possible about these ministering spirits. He believed that such knowledge was absolutely essential both for the health of the Christian soul and for the right ordering of the church. This chapter examines the contexts and content of the Seraphic Doctor's angelology. The first section describes the ambient angelology of Bonaventure's era, the many ways in which angels were present in daily life. The second section explores the reasons why Bonaventure's training in Paris and his multiple roles as a teacher, preacher, and Franciscan led him to develop his angelology. The third section describes what the Seraphic Doctor actually says about angels, not only about their nature and general characteristics, but also about why these topics should be important.

Section 1: Angels in Medieval Europe

Bonaventure was born into a world teeming with angels. Indeed, before he was even born, God had assigned a guardian angel to protect him in the womb. (For a discussion of Bonaventure's views on guardian angels, particularly on when these angels begin their duties, see section 3, below.) Prayers to these particular angels were added to the liturgy in the thirteenth century, and votive masses in honor of the angels who support the souls in Purgatory had been celebrated as part of the weekly cycle of votive masses for centuries. Indeed, in diverse ways the church of Bonaventure's era was engaged with the spirits of heaven and their earthly ministries.

Angels were an integral part of the medieval landscape. The great shrines to Michael the Archangel, such as Monte Gargano or Mont-Saint-Michel, were prominent pilgrimage destinations, and it is not too hard to imagine Bonaventure conversing with pilgrims as he walked across Europe, perhaps even inquiring about the images of the great Archangel on their pilgrims' badges or discussing the importance of Michael's

victory of Satan as told in the Apocalypse.[1] Chapels to Michael and his colleagues were also built in many local churches, and Michael's feast day (29 September) annually focused the attention of the church on the work of angels and their roles in the divine economy.[2] Some of Bonaventure's most revealing statements about angels appear in his sermons delivered on this feast.

Churches and cathedrals presented angels to Christians in their stained glass, tympana, and spandrels. These physical depictions served as reminders of the ubiquitous presence of the angels. Reliquaries sometimes also displayed angels with arms outstretched offering the sacred power of a relic to those seeking healing or indulgences. Men and women could reach out and touch angels; angels, after all, were reaching out to them.

This sensory element of angels would have been reinforced by the powerful connections between angels and the mass, a topic regularly discussed in medieval treatises on the mass. In addition to the angels bearing thuribles in stained glass, Bonaventure and many others could have seen angels on the pyx (quite appropriately, since to partake of the bread was to taste the "bread of angels," see Ps. 78:25) or other liturgical vessels. Because of traditions inherited from the patristic era and the patristic exegesis of scripture, the medieval experience of the mass included an awareness of the connection between the aromas of incense and the heavenly ascent of prayers through the mediation of angels.[3] The earthly and heavenly choirs joined together in the singing of the *Sanctus*, a hymn derived from Isaiah's vision of the seraphim in Is. 6. Thus, Bonaventure's many references to the "Holy! Holy! Holy!" of the seraphim in non-liturgical contexts would have clearly evoked the liturgical subtext of the *Sanctus* to a medi-

---

[1] On the history of the cult of St Michael, see John Charles Arnold, *Ego Sum Michael: The Origin and Diffusion of the Christian Cult of St. Michael the Archangel* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas: 1997).

[2] Bonaventure reports that Francis had a special devotion to St Michael. Both the *Legenda major* and the *minor* record that Francis had a custom of fasting in honor of St Michael that lasted until the Archangel's feast day. It was after this annual fast in October 1224 that Francis reportedly received the stigmata; see LMj 13.1, LMn 6.1. Francis himself refers to Michael several times in his own writings (ER 18.1 [also see AP 36; L3C 57], 23.6; ExhP 17; OfP compline, antiphon 3), and Brother Leo's *Parchment* mentions Francis' devotion to St Michael. While the earlier hagiographical tradition mentions Francis' devotion to St Michael (AC 118 and 2C 197), it is Bonaventure who first associated Francis' annual fast with the stigmata.

[3] See Jean Daniélou, *The Angels and Their Mission*, trans. David Heimann (Westminster: 1957) and Eric Peterson, *The Angels and the Liturgy*, trans. Ronald Walls (New York, 1964). For a fuller discussion of this issue as well as the topics discussed in this essay, see my *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages* (New York: 1998).

eval audience. The mass, therefore, was a stimulation of the senses—the aromas of incense, the sounds of music, the taste of the eucharist—and all of these were experienced in churches resplendent with the depictions of angels in glass, stone, and wood.

It is not surprising then that in *On How to Prepare for the Celebration of the Mass*, Bonaventure's list of the benefits of the eucharist includes "association with the angels" alongside the "reduction of pain," "arming against the devil," "enlightenment of the mind," and several others. Elsewhere he enjoins a fellow Franciscan to emulate the inner peace of the angels before celebrating the mass. He also offers his admonition not to eat before performing the sacrament as an example of the "discerning selection" that establishes the proper hierarchy of choices in the well-ordered soul which, he says, "pertains to the Archangels."[4]

Angels, as the Greek word *aggelos* suggests, are messengers. Both scriptural narratives and popular medieval accounts offered many stories of the heavenly spirits appearing to men and women. Certainly, the development of angelology to a large extent derives its strength from this belief that angels continue to manifest themselves to mortals. Just as the portals of Notre Dame de Paris contained sculptures of the biblical patriarchs alongside those of the early church fathers and even medieval saints, so too did medieval Christians see themselves in the context of the ongoing work of angels. Bonaventure proclaims forcefully (and defends with vigor), "Without a doubt, the beatified angels are sent to us by God."[5] Moreover, as the lives of Francis and countless other saints demonstrate, angels and saints interacted frequently, so frequently that angels become a regular feature of formal saints' lives. There is a sense that an awareness of their presence is a sign of one's holiness or spiritual progress (the angels even came to play music for Francis when he was ill). According to Bonaventure, other holy people could approach the example set by Francis and thus speak with angels.[6] Given such a conceptual framework,

---

[4] Bonaventure, *Tractatus de praeparatione ad missam* 1.9 (trans., 225–226); *Brev.*, Prologue 6.5 (trans., 22), 1.9 (trans., 225–226); *Epistola continens viginti quinque memorialia*, 12; and *Hex.* 22.35 (trans., 358). References to translations of Bonaventure's works other than *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* and the *Legenda major sancti Francisci* are to the translation by José de Vinck, *The Works of Bonaventure*, 5 vols. (Paterson, NJ: 1960–70). References to translations of the *Itinerarium* and the *Legenda major* are to the translation of Ewert Cousins, *Bonaventure: The Soul's Journey into God, The Tree of Life, and the Life of Saint Francis* (New York: 1978).

[5] Bonaventure, *II Sent.* d. 10, a. I, q. I, concl. (2, 260.)

[6] *Serm.* (8, 614b).

it is not surprising that Bonaventure is in some sense "on the lookout" for angels throughout his professional career (unfortunately, we know so very little about his life before Paris).

Finally, the death rituals of medieval Christianity would also have presented Bonaventure and other medieval Christians with regular occasions for recognizing the importance of the angels. In part as a response to fears about demons seizing the souls of the dead, the Commendations became a central feature of medieval dying. Included in these prayers, which may be as old as the fifth century and which are present throughout medieval liturgies, are the *Subvenite* and the *Suscipiat*, two prayers seeking angelic support. At several times—at the moment of death, as the body is prepared, as it is carried to the church, during the recitation of the Office of the Dead, and at the absolution—the living would have prayed the *Subvenite*, "Come to his assistance, ye saints of God, meet him, ye angels of the Lord, receiving his soul, offering it in the sight of the Most High." Subsequently, they would pray the *Suscipiat*: "May Christ, who has called thee, receive thee and may the angels conduct thee into Abraham's bosom." The living were able to let their friend, family, member, or colleague go, with the hope that he or she would join a new society of angels and saints. Moreover, the ritual of the Commendations, the texts of which were often illustrated with depictions of angels bearing souls upward, allowed Christians to assist the dead in this uncertain transition.[7] This theme of the angels bearing the saved to heaven was important for Bonaventure. He refers to the story of angels bearing Lazarus into heaven (Lk. 16:22) frequently in his sermons on the feast of St Michael; it serves as a recurring motif.[8] That Franciscans shared poverty with Lazarus was likely also a factor in the appeal of this story to Bonaventure.

In the *Soliloquy*, Bonaventure, following Mt. 22:30 ("For in the resurrection they [men and women] neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven"), reminds the soul to "turn your thoughts to the choirs of angels, for in some way you resemble them by your nature, and you will be their companion in glory." In this text he affirms the traditional identification between redeemed souls and angels. The soul

[7] For translations of the prayers and a discussion of the Commendations, see Pamela Sheingorn, "'And Flights of Angels Sing Thee to Thy Rest': The Soul's Conveyance to the Afterlife in the Middle Ages," in Carol Garrett Fisher and Kathleen L. Scott, ed., *Art Into Life: Collected Papers from the Kresge Art Museum Medieval Symposia* (East Lansing: 1995), 160–161 and 177.

[8] *Serm.* (9, 618a and 630a).

knows that it will join one of the heavenly choirs, and indeed, each person will be placed joyfully in the hierarchy appropriate to his or her life. And this joy will express itself as it was depicted in medieval iconography—as the singing of the *Sanctus* with the seraphim and the celebration of the heavenly liturgy. The joining of the angelic and human societies in praise, which is experienced only partially during the mass on earth, will be known fully in heaven.[9]

Thus, humans and angels interacted regularly during worship and the practices of popular piety, and even before Bonaventure arrived in Paris for formal studies, it is likely that his angelological sensibilities had been stimulated by these diverse forms of angelic impact on medieval life.

Section 2: Angelology as a Professional Requirement

Bonaventure's own particular training, formation, and professional trajectory required him to develop his angelology in great detail. Because he was an exegete, preacher, scholastic, Minister General of the Franciscans, biographer of Francis, priest (eventually a cardinal bishop), and mystic, Bonaventure had numerous contexts that demanded him to be conversant with the ways of the ministering spirits. While medieval scholastic angelology has received the most scholarly attention in modern times, it is important to note that understanding the depth and breadth of the Seraphic Doctor's angelology requires attention to the many facets of his career. Indeed, the fact that he takes up the subject of angels in so many diverse contexts indicates how important angelology was to him.

Bonaventure's Formation as a Scholastic

Bonaventure's training as a *baccalareus biblicus* in Paris required him to study scripture thoroughly (particularly because of the Franciscan emphasis on reading the whole Bible), and some of his most important statements on angelology come as a result of exegesis for either scholastic or homiletic purposes. The church fathers had bequeathed rich traditions about the angels in scripture and how they should be interpreted, and through reading Augustine or the *Glossa Ordinaria*, Bonaventure drank deeply from centuries of tradition about the angels of scripture. As shall

[9] *Solil.* 1.7 (trans., 47).

be seen below, he also inherited a number of classic and perennial issues that he was required to address as a student and master in Paris.

In various ways, both his Franciscan training and his reading of Aristotle led him to emphasize the literal meaning of scripture, and since scripture contained numerous references to angels, Bonaventure took these passages quite seriously as part of the literal, even historical record.[10] At the same time, the Seraphic Doctor was also intrigued by other levels of the Bible. Bonaventure, who in many of his works declares his desire for a retreat from the world, personally finds the anagogical reading of scripture the most important of the Bible's four senses.[11] In the thirteenth century, scholastics were especially fascinated by the anagogical level of scripture because of the influence of Pseudo-Dionysius. The supposed convert of St Paul had stressed the importance of anagogy because anagogy elevates the mind, bringing it heavenwards, towards the angels. Bonaventure formally acknowledged his debt to the Areopagite for his anagogical reading of scripture, and his writings present abundant examples of his anagogical readings of angels. He reads, for example, the stars and heavens of Gen. 15:5 ("Abram, look at the heavens and, if you can, count the stars") via anagogy as angels, and one of the four faces of the creatures in Ezekiel is, via anagogy, the "loftiness of the angels." Likewise, he preaches in a rather matter-of-fact tone that the golden shields of 1 Macc. 6:39 are also angels.[12] The anagogical sense, therefore, kept the image of the angels perpetually in Bonaventure's mind. While the authority of the *Glossa* was helpful for identifying the patristic anagogical readings of angels, it was not necessary; Bonaventure observed that new meanings and new anagogies were still being discovered.[13]

---

[10] On the history of medieval exegesis, see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (New York: 1952); *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: 1969); and Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (New Haven: 1984). For Bonaventure's exegetical training, see Thomas Reist, *Saint Bonaventure as a Biblical Commentator* (New York: 1985).

[11] Bonaventure, *De Reductione artium ad theologiam* 7. For brief treatments of the history of the four-fold scheme, see Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform* (New Haven: 1980), 63–68. For a more complete study of medieval exegetical practices, see James S. Preus, *From Shadow to Promise* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1969), 9–149, and Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatres sens de l'écriture*, 4 vols. (Paris: 1959–1964).

[12] For Bonaventure's debt to the Areopagite, see *Red. Art.* 5. For his readings of Genesis and Ezekiel, see *Hex.* 2.16 (trans., 29–30) and 13.19 (trans., 194). Bonaventure's *Sermones de Angelis* draw heavily on anagogy. See, for example see, *Serm.* (9, 613b, 614b, 621a, 622a, and 630a). For the shields as angels, see *Serm.* (9, 689a).

[13] See, for example, *Hex.* 13.2 and 15.12. See also Reist, *Bonaventure*, 36.

After his study of scripture, Bonaventure proceeded to theology, and here, too, angels were an integral part of his training. In his *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure begins his discussion of the angels, "In proper sequence, our next topic is the spiritual, incorporeal nature, that is, the nature of the angels."[14] His use of the phrase "in proper sequence" suggests that the consideration of the angelic nature was no longer an ad hoc theological topic, as it had been for Bernard of Clairvaux and his fellow monastics, but rather a subject with a clearly defined place in theology. As Peter Lombard's *Sentences*—which assigned a particular conceptual location for angelology—became a standard part of the curriculum, investigations of the subtle metaphysical nature of the angels also became a formal and official part of every theology student's training. Thus, as a student of the theology faculty and as a future master, Bonaventure, like the rest of his colleagues, simply had no choice but to examine questions of the nature of the angels.

Partly responding to twelfth-century controversies over the Neoplatonic and scriptural accounts of creation, Lombard locates formal discussions of angels in his Book 2, which covered the creation and sin. Because of their creation at the beginning of time, and because of their venerable status as creatures closest to God, angels possess a clear place at the beginning of the exposition of the created order. The outline of angelological topics treated by Lombard in his *Sentences* is as follows:

The creation of the angels
The precise timing of the creation of the angels
Where the angels were created
The qualities of the angels at their creation (including questions of angelic metaphysics)
The fall and confirmation of the angels
The location and powers of the fallen angels
The attributes (cognitive, moral, and physical) of angels and demons
The corporeality of angels and demons
The angelic hierarchies
The ministrations of the angels to humans
Guardian angels

[14] *Brev.* 2.6 (trans., 86).

Bonaventure and his colleagues in Paris inherited an organized, systematic treatment of the angels and their nature that ultimately served as the armature for their extensive angelological speculation.

As Bonaventure wrestled with the angels in Paris, he inherited not only an extensive exegetical tradition from the fathers and the topical scheme of the *Sentences*, but also a number of competing philosophical traditions about the angels.[15] Platonism (of various forms) had shaped the fathers' understanding of angels, and the "Dionysius renaissance" of the thirteenth century and the impact of Pseudo-Dionysius' *Celestial Hierarchy* reinforced some Platonic elements in angelology.[16] Since Pseudo-Dionysius himself had used both "angels" and "intelligences" in his own work, medieval theologians had further reason to wrestle with the potential truths and falsehoods in philosophical discussions of intelligences and spirits.

On the other hand, Bonaventure's era also witnessed the ongoing recovery of Aristotelian texts and frameworks and their integration with theology. How, if at all, might biblical revelations of angels fit with the theory of active and passive intellects, the distinction between essence and existence, and the issue of hylomorphism, the doctrine that all creatures, even angels, are composed of both matter and form? The Arabic philosophers who had helped to transmit these Aristotelian concepts also became part of scholastic angelology, and Bonaventure was compelled to develop critical and integrative strategies in his teachings on the angels. For Bonaventure, the major gulf between Christian wisdom and pagan philosophy is the latter's ignorance of the purpose of creation. The reason God created the spirits of heaven was not to move the spheres but to enjoy the beatific vision. Without this knowledge of God's plan for the universe, philosophers inevitably reach erroneous conclusions about the intelligences of heaven.[17]

Angelology, however, was not a purely intellectual endeavor. In the context of the intense competition between individual masters and between the seculars and the religious in thirteenth-century Paris, the field of angelology was something of a battleground. Because of the complexities of angelology (e.g., if angels are spirits, they probably do not have bodies, but if they do not have bodies and sense organs, how can they "see"

---

[15] For a guide to this topic, see Tobias Hoffmann, *A Companion to Angels in Medieval Philosophy* (Leiden: 2012).

[16] On the "Dionysius renaissance," see Joseph Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. (Chicago: 1971), 87.

[17] *Hex.* 5.23–27.

anything?), this area was ripe for competitive discourse. And because angelology could have profound implications (e.g. the angelic hierarchies can be a model for earthly hierarchies), the study of angels was a form of power. So heated were these issues that nearly one-seventh of the Condemnations of 1277 concerned false propositions about the angels (many of which Bonaventure had rejected).

Because the Franciscan school in Paris only had one chair in theology, Bonaventure had to refine his skills impressively if he was to stay. Furthermore, the enmity between the secular masters and the mendicants at the time of his training was so great that he must have felt enormous pressure to demonstrate theological excellence. For the mendicants, successful disputation was necessary for corporate survival in Paris. Consequently, just as the masters who began to teach in the nascent cathedral schools of the early twelfth century developed their theologies in the midst of fierce competition for students, fees, and offices, so did scholastics such as Bonaventure formulate their complex angelology as a way to establish the theological credentials they would need to become a master at one of the schools in Paris.

Bonaventure's Formation as a Franciscan

By accepting a simple habit, a monk inherited an ancient tradition of understanding the religious life in terms of angels. The central elements of the monastic life, the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, are characteristics that also apply to the life of the saints and angels in heaven.[18] *The Rule of Saint Benedict* appropriately links the angels with the monastic life (see chs. 7 and 19). Bonaventure, citing Bernard, likewise argues that the religious life allows a man to live the angelic life even on earth. Similarly, in one of his sermons the Seraphic Doctor exhorts an audience of Beguines that to live the lives of the truly religious, they must live like the angels in physical and moral purity and obedience. And in sermons delivered to his fellow Franciscans on the feast of St Michael, he preaches on the traditional identifications between the virtue of chastity and the angels.[19]

Franciscan angelology thus exhibited significant continuities with the monastic angelology that preceded it. But at the same time, different

[18] On this topic, see Jean Leclerq, "Monasticism and Angelism," *Downside Review* 85 (1967): 127–137.

[19] *Serm.* (9, 523a, 621a, and 628a).

aspects of the angels assumed new importance. For Bernard, the monastic-angelic life was a life of stability, prayer, and contemplation; when Bernard states that being a monk made a man more like an angel than other men, his vision of monasticism was a vision of corporate isolation and communal prayer—the image of an undisturbed heavenly choir. For the Franciscans, the Franciscan-angelic life included an active, apostolic ministry; the Franciscan-made-angel not only prayed, but also preached and ministered to the poor. Francis and his order were a crucial response to the evolution of medieval society, and the transformation of monastic writings about angels in a new social and religious context were part of that response. While the Dominicans, too, display an interest in the angels, for several reasons particular to their founder and their mission, the Franciscans became particularly obsessed with crucial problems of angelology.

Francis's exemplary life and his injunctions led his followers to revere and contemplate the angels in a distinctive way. (For the Seraphic Doctor's interpretation of the crucial event of the seraphic Christ's giving Francis the stigmata, and for the impact of Franciscan apocalyptic speculation on Bonaventure's angelology, see section 3, below.) Francis himself directed the brothers' spiritual imaginations to the ranks of the heavenly hierarchy. Bonaventure describes Francis' personal dedication to the angels:

> [Francis] was joined by a chain of inseparable love to the angels (…). Because of his devotion to the angels he used to fast and pray constantly during the forty days after the Assumption of the glorious Virgin. Because of the fervent zeal he had for the salvation of all, he was devoted with a special love to blessed Michael the Archangel, who has the office of presenting souls to God.[20]

Bonaventure, not surprisingly, affirms that Christ and his Mother are the most important objects of Francis' devotion. But this does not inhibit or diminish Francis' love for the angels or Bonaventure's description of his ardor for these spirits. While the hierarchy of devotional import remains clear, the value of the angels also remains affirmed.

Francis reminded his followers that the angels frequently reside in sacred locations. After his conversion experience in 1206, he labored for two years in the area around Assisi. In addition to caring for lepers, he also reestablished three dilapidated churches, including one consecrated to St Mary of the Angels. Bonaventure records that Francis believed that this

[20] *Leg. maj.* 9.3.

church was one of the places in Christian Europe that was special to angels: "On account of the name of the church (…) he [Francis] experienced the frequency of angelic visitations there." Thus Francis "established his home there on account of his reverence for the angels and his preeminent love for the mother of Christ." In the fourteenth century, Brother Francis Bartoli recorded that Francis and others had indeed heard and seen angels at St Mary's.[21] This church and this location, linked as it was to the angels, became an important part of the history of Francis and his order. In 1221, the Franciscans held a general chapter there, and the saint himself died in the church in 1226. Through Francis' devotional habits, encounters with angels became a part of the Franciscan experience.

After his death, Francis was interpreted through the lens of angelology. In Bonaventure's Prologue to his *Legenda major* (a text commissioned as the official *vita* for the saint), he identifies Francis literally and figuratively as an angel, a divine messenger. Furthermore, the *Fioretti di San Francesco* records that the order's corporate memory viewed the founder as an angel; Brother Masseo likened Francis to an angel who illuminates souls and transmits grace. For the Friars Minor, the image of the founder and the idea of God's messengers were typologically inseparable. Hence, as the *Fioretti* suggests, the Franciscans came to understand themselves in terms of angels.[22]

More specifically, a typology of Franciscans as angels with distinctive dual callings became central to Franciscan self-understanding. The overwhelming theme of Bonaventure's surviving sermons delivered on the feast of St Michael is the angels' perfect combination of activity in the world with their perfect contemplation of the divine.[23] Throughout these sermons, delivered mainly to Franciscans whom he hoped to guide in the apostolic life, he considers both aspects of angelic existence. Humans cannot both contemplate God and minister to others in the same act, as angels can, but by contemplating the angels, the Franciscans can better approach the unity of ministration and prayer. The reward of a ministry in this life is the enhanced ability to contemplate the divine: "faithful

[21] *Leg. maj.* 2.8. Francis Bartoli, *Tractatus de Indulgentia S. Mariae de Portiuncula*, ed. by P. Sabatier (Paris: 1900), 3, 13, 19–20, 54.

[22] For Brother Masseo, see *I Fioretti de San Francesco*, ed. G. Paganani (Rome: 1959), ch. 29. For other references to Francis as an angel, see chs. 11 and 27. For Franciscans as angels, see, for example, chs. 6, 17, 43, 47.

[23] The texts of these sermons are in *Opera Omnia* 9, 609–631. See esp. 615a–18a, 619b, 620a–22a.

exertion in good work calms the conscience, enriches it, and elevates it into the heavens."[24]

The acceptance of the life of poverty lay at the heart of the *Poverello*'s spiritual enterprise, and appropriately, poverty also lay at the heart of Franciscan angelology. According to one record of Francis' life and words, Francis claimed that poverty "made the soul while fixed on earth converse with angels in the heavens." Thus, although the Franciscans embraced voluntary poverty, Bonaventure declares that by elevating their minds to the heavenly hierarchy, poor Christians will not be poor men (*pauperes*). Indeed, even those who have no riches will one day reign like princes with the angels of heaven.[25] The hope of being with the angels thus encourages Francis and his followers to renounce the transient pleasures of the coin. This Franciscan emphasis on the link between poverty and the angels represents a new emphasis on what had been a relatively undeveloped theme. Such a connection had been present in the monastic writings, generally subsumed under the category of the angelic aversion to the material world. With the Friars Minor, however, the relationship between angels and voluntary poverty becomes explicit.

Bonaventure's Liturgical and Mystical Formation

As someone responsible for leading worship, presiding at mass, and, eventually, helping to oversee the liturgical regulations for the Franciscans, Bonaventure worked within medieval traditions regarding angels and human worship. Michael's feast day was a regular occasion for preaching on angels, a responsibility he seems to have enjoyed (in part because of Francis' own dedication to the angels). Indeed, for Bonaventure, worship and angelology were inseparable; in a sermon delivered on the feast of St Michael, Bonaventure explores the meaning of Ps. 137:1 (Vulgate: "In the sight of the angels, I sing to you"). Following the *Glossa*, he states that humans are to sing praises to God with the angels.[26]

In his *Legenda major*, Bonaventure repeats the maxim that "in prayer we speak to God, hear him, and converse with the angels as if we were living an angelic life." The very act of prayer draws humans and celestial

---

[24] See *Hex.* 21.24 (trans., 334) and 2.5 (trans., 23).

[25] For Francis, see *Actus beati Francisci et sociorum ejus*, ed. Paul Sabatier (Paris: 1902), ch. 13, p. 48. Bonaventure, *Serm.* (9, 612a and 339b).

[26] *Serm.* (9, 619).

spirits together. And in a sermon delivered on the feast of St Michael, the Seraphic Doctor argues that because the angels transmit humans' prayers to God, humans can be reconciled to the Lord. But Bonaventure also minimizes the angels in his discussion of prayer in the *Breviloquium*. He distinguishes between "personal prayer" (which requires no mediators) and "prayer through the saints" (which includes angels as *sancti*, holy ones), and while prayer through the saints signifies the proper relationship between higher and lower members of the body of Christ, angels receive no treatment as the potential bearers of personal prayers.[27] The mediation of angels forms one minor but distinct part of these different types of prayer.

The devotional implications of angels were also important to him, as a confessor and spiritual guide. Thus, drawing on the Book of Tobit, Bonaventure identifies Raphael's special assistance in confronting one's sins. Raphael leads men to compunction, reminds humans of the passion of Christ, and aids in the transmission of prayers for forgiveness (which Bonaventure stresses, can be efficacious because of Raphael and the angels). In a sermon on Lk. 15:10 ("There is joy before the angels of God over one sinner who repents"), and in contrast to the pain signified by the flaming sword of the cherubim, he links angelic joy with the efficacy of the sacrament of confession.[28]

Angelology also has a distinctive, though limited place in the Seraphic Doctor's mysticism. In his *Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum*, he utilizes three of his favorite angelic images: the six-winged seraph, the two cherubim who stand atop the arc of the covenant, and the nine hierarchies themselves.[29] Seeing Francis' encounter with the seraph as the key to the mystical path, Bonaventure concludes that there are six stages in the quest for God, three external and three internal: through the creation, in human perception of the lower creatures, through humanity's own natural mental powers, in God's image in the grace-filled soul, through God's being, and in God's goodness. The two wings of the seraph that cover the seraph's feet signify the first two stages, the things which are below humans. The second pair of wings, which cover the body, pertain to those things that properly belong

---

[27] *Leg. maj.* 12.1; *Serm.* (9, 626b); and *Brev.* 5.10.1–3 (trans., 217–218).

[28] *Serm.* (9, 625b–626b and 366–369).

[29] For a discussion of the seraphim in Bonaventure's mysticism, see E. Randolph Daniel, "St. Bonaventure: Defender of Franciscan Eschatology," in J.G. Bougerol (ed.), *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974* (Rome: 1973–4), vol. 4, 793–806.

to humanity, and the third set of wings, which hover above, exemplify God who is above humanity. The six-winged seraph then, provides the structure for Bonaventure's entire treatise.

Similarly, the two cherubim provide Bonaventure with a way of distinguishing between the contemplation of God through "the attributes proper to his essence" and the contemplation of the "attributes proper to the Persons." The two angels who "are turned toward each other, but with their faces looking toward the propitiatory" contain, according to Bonaventure, this "mysterious significance." The two angels allow Bonaventure to do justice both to the unity of God and to the Trinity. Finally, Bonaventure compares the ascent of the soul with the nine orders. He finds that the lowest three ranks pertain to man's nature, the next three to his own effort, and the last three to God's grace.[30] Just as the cherubim mediated between the unity and Trinity of God, so do the nine orders mediate between the three major aspects of spiritual progress. He combines and orders the essential elements of nature, merit, and grace, according to the scheme that the angels provide. The explanatory value of the angels for Bonaventure can hardly be underestimated, but the angels' direct contribution to the actual experience of the mystical was not developed by the Seraphic Doctor. As in Richard of St Victor's meditations on the significance of the cherubim on the ark of the covenant in his *The Mystical Ark* (which influenced Bonaventure's own writing), angels are interpreted as figures for human contemplation, as symbols for elevating the soul or mind toward God.

Thus, the greatest value of angels for Bonaventure's mysticism and its related experiences seems to have been linguistic and conceptual. The six-winged seraph, the two cherubim of the ark, and the nine hierarchies of angels provide Bonaventure with ways of speaking about the ascent of the soul and the culminating experience and worship of the divine. At the same time, it is important to note that according to the transcriber of the *Collationes in Hexaemeron* (the surviving text is a student's record of Bonaventure's lectures), Bonaventure also once communicated with an angel: "And he [Bonaventure] said that he once spoke to one of them to whose order Gabriel belonged." The eighth minister general of Francis's order directly experienced the reality of angels.[31] Bonaventure's angelology,

[30] *Itin.* 6.5–6 (trans., 52–3); 6.4 (trans., 52); and 4.4.
[31] *Hex.* 21.20 (trans., 332).

then, appears to have been based in part on a personal encounter (unfortunately, it is not known when this angelic encounter took place).

Bonaventure's angelology emerged over several decades in many quite different contexts. His contemplative side appears to have led him to strive to keep diverse aspects of his understanding of the angels together. As shall be seen, his reflections on the personhood of the angels—a primarily exegetical and devotional problem—were grounded in his metaphysical framework. The following distillation of Bonaventure's teachings and hypothetical explorations concerning angels thus draws together diverse sources and presents a kind of systematic angelology. Bonaventure's most systematic presentations of angels—in his *Commentary on the Sentences* and his *Breviloquium*—are presentations in scholastic contexts. But Bonaventure's own passionate exploration of the angels, their nature, their mission, and the ways in which these intersect with his professional commitments lead him to develop many other aspects of angelology. The synthesis presented here is thus somewhat artificial, but it brings out the breadth and depth of the Seraphic Doctor's commitment to angelology.

Section 3: Bonaventure's Angelology

The Creation

Not only did Bonaventure need to interpret Genesis in light of the challenges and opportunities of philosophical speculation, but he also extensively investigated the creation of the angels and the angelic nature because of the kinship between angels and humans. Of all God's creatures, human beings are nearest to the angels, and angelology thus promises to illuminate anthropology. In the modern world, the impulse to learn about human nature from closely-related beings has shifted subjects from seraphim to simians. Whereas modern scientists study the origins of the apes to uncover clues about humanity, medieval theologians investigated the origins of the angels.

Genesis itself says nothing of the creation of the angels (unless they are understood as "light," which was one option for exegetes). This apparent silence opened the door for various pagan or heretical interpretations of angels. Could the angels be uncreated emanations, or possibly co-creators, or even the creators of the corrupt material order? Beginning with the revived interest in Platonic and Neo-Platonic creation accounts initiated by the school of Chartres, medieval theologians became vigorously involved in debates over the creation, and a number of different views

emerged.[32] In the history of angelology, however, it was to be Aristotle and his pagan commentators who were to offer the most decisive challenges and who were to evoke the most sustained angelological investigations of the Middle Ages.

On the most important issues concerning the creation and the angels—that angels are created by God and that God alone is to be considered a creator in this sense of bringing something into existence *ex nihilo*—Christian theologians of the medieval period did not differ from each other or from the orthodox patristic consensus. At the same time, the scholastics, like the fathers, also sometimes disagreed among themselves on less crucial issues—e.g., whether angels were created with grace of any sort, or whether the angels were created before the corporeal world—and while some disputes could be bitter, in many cases the scholastics agreed to disagree.[33]

But what, precisely, are the productive, generative, or creative powers of the angels? Even if they were not co-creators at the beginning of time, can they be said to make or create anything subsequently? Bonaventure follows Lombard and Augustine on the capacities of the angels to "create."[34] The angels and demons can create an object to the extent that a human can craft a piece of pottery. The potter "creates" an object in that he has brought a new thing out of an existing material, but he has not created an object *ex nihilo*. Neither angel nor human can accomplish such a feat.[35]

The affirmation that God had created the angels raised several more questions. Where, if anywhere, did God create the angels? Are the spiritual angels subject to time and change, as physical bodies are? Did God create the evil angels? Why did they turn from God? Did time elapse between their creation and their fall? Why did the persevering angels not fall? Following what became the consensus in the twelfth century, Bonaventure states that at the first moment of creation, God made the empyrean heaven (which is above the celestial orbs which circle the earth), the

---

[32] Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden: 1994), vol. 1, 303–353, and "Early Scholastic Angelology," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 62 (1995): 80–109. For a discussion of Hugh's and William's explorations of these matters see Hugh of St Victor, *The Didascalicon*, trans. Jerome Taylor (New York: 1961), 14, 170 n. 127, and 227 n. 3.

[33] See, for example, Bonaventure, *II Sent.* d. 4, a. 1, q. 2 (2, pp. 132–134), and Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.50.3 and 1.61.3.

[34] Peter Lombard, *Sentences* II, d. 7, c. 8. For Augustine, see *On the Trinity* 3.8.13.

[35] *II Sent.* d. 7, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1 (2, 196–199) and *II Sent.* d. 7, p. 2 dub. 3 (2, 206–207).

angels (created in the empyrean), matter, and time itself.[36] Bonaventure's explanation of the nature of the empyrean draws on his understanding of God's perfect creation, physics, and soteriology. The stable empyrean completes the universe, helps to explain the motion of the planets and stars, and provides a place for angels and saints to dwell. From the empyrean, the angels descend to earth to exercise their missions to humans; from the empyrean, the noblest place of all creation, the angels can contemplate the divine most readily. The angelic nature, being non-corporeal, does not require being in a place, but Bonaventure states that being in a spatial place gives the angels proper order with respect to themselves and the rest of the creation. The angels exist in a place not out of necessity, but out of congruence with God's ordering of the cosmos. Thus, the angels could have been created before the corporeal universe. Augustine had recognized that it was possible to argue both that the angels had been created before the cosmos and that the angels were created at the same time as the cosmos. For him, however, as with Bonaventure and Aquinas, the essential point remained that in either case the angels were not at all to be seen as coeternal with God.[37] Throughout all of these reflections on spiritual beings, orthodox theologians fervently maintain the distinctions between angels and God.

As created beings, the angels are not eternal. However, as spirits who are not subject to the vicissitudes of time and temporality as corporeal creatures are, they are not really temporal. What time-related category, therefore, is proper for the angels? The term adopted by thirteenth-century theologians to describe the duration of angels was aeviternity. For Bonaventure, eternity has neither a beginning nor an end; aeviternity has a beginning and an after without variations; and time has a beginning and end with variations.[38]

The fall of Satan and his minions was another particularly important topic, because it focused theological reflection on the relationships between God's providence, rational free will, love, faithfulness, and sin. Bonaventure notes that to assert that God created the fallen angels evil would be heretical (such a view apparently circulated in some form; in

---

[36] Bonaventure's discussions of these subjects begins at *II Sent.* d. 2, p. 1 (2, 68). For Aquinas, see *Summa Theologiae* 1.61–63. For a more thorough discussion of the scholastic treatment of these subjects, see J.D. Collins, *The Thomistic Philosophy of the Angels* (Washington: 1947).

[37] Augustine, *City of God* 11.32. See also Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.61.2.

[38] *II Sent.*, d. 2, p. 1, a. 1, q. 3 (2, 62–63). On the idea of aeviternity and a comparison of the views of Aquinas, Alexander of Hales (Bonaventure's mentor), and Bonaventure, see Collins, *Thomistic*, 346–361.

1240, the bishop of Paris had condemned the view that the demons were evil from their creation).[39]

As Bonaventure presents the sequence of the angels' fall, a very, very small space of time (a *morula*) after their creation, some of the angels fell away from God.[40] The Seraphic Doctor, in Augustinian fashion, affirms that pride (*superbia*) was the original sin of Satan and his followers. They desired to be equal to God. They fell into the middle air between heaven and earth, and from there, they descend to hell to torture the souls of the damned. Those angels who did not fall, instead turned toward God and were forever confirmed in their glory by the grace of God. The angels were confirmed in their original hierarchies (which had been established by nature and were now made permanent by God's gift). Because the nature of the angelic intellect and will is such that their first free choice would determine forever their orientation towards good or evil, the evil angels are incapable of being redeemed. The free will of the good angels is completed and perfected by their confirmation by grace, as they have been transformed from a state of sinlessness to a state of perfection. Both types of angel had sufficient knowledge of their alternatives at the moment of their decision (thus, their freedom, knowledge, and responsibility are inseparable and sufficient), but through their own will and pride, the demons fell.

Thirteenth-century scholastics essentially agreed to disagree about whether the angels were created with any form of grace. Bonaventure, his mentor, Alexander of Hales, and Hugh of St Victor argued that the angels were not created with the superadded gift of grace. Aquinas (and Peter Lombard, Stephen Langton, and others) argued that angels were created with grace, and he supported it with his own understanding of the relationship between nature and grace, arguing, as he must, that this grace given to the demons was resisted or at least not utilized. Bonaventure affirms that both views are possible, but he (like Aquinas) states that the view he chooses is "more probable." It is not possible to fully explore this debate here, but it is important to note that as thirteenth-century theologians are exploring the mechanics of the creation, fall, and confirmation of the angels, they approach their material with a certain reserve. They

---

[39] *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, conc. and a. 2, q. 1, conc. (2, 113 and 116). For the bishop's condemnation, see the *scholion* to the second of the two sections cited in this note (2, 117).

[40] Bonaventure's discussions of the fall and confirmation of the angels occur in *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2; d. 5, a. 1, q. 1–3; d. 5, a. 3, q. 1; d. 6, a. 2, q. 1; d. 7, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1; and d. 7, p. 1, a. 2, q. 1. See also *Breviloquium* 2.7–8 and *II Sent.* d. 9, a. 1, q. 9, conc. (2, 257).

are aware that their investigations can only proceed so far. Nevertheless, they remain committed to exploring these matters as fully as they possibly can.[41]

The fall of the evil angels had important implications for humanity. Their rebellion and punishment left their heavenly thrones vacant, and, according to most theologians, God ordained matters such that the saints would come to fill these blessed seats. Thus, as Bonaventure presents the life of the model for human sanctity, Francis, he describes a vision which reveals that Francis will occupy a celestial seat once occupied by an angel, a seat decorated with precious stones and that radiated glory.[42] It is hardly surprising that in a sermon on Lk. 15:10, Bonaventure sees in the rejoicing of the angels over the repentance of sinners a sign that the salvation of sinners helps restore the angelic hierarchies.[43]

Hylomorphism and Angelic Bodies

Bonaventure declares in his *Commentary on the Sentences* that, "It must be said that without a doubt the beatified angels are sent to us by God."[44] The great investigations of the thirteenth-century scholastics into the nature and character of the angels come from the encounters between Abraham, Francis, so many others and the angels. What do angels look like? Do they have bodies? How would medieval Christians have recognized an angel? Do they have personalities or emotions? How many of these creatures are there?

In Scripture, angels usually appear as some sort of men. (Curious creatures, such as the chariots and wheels which appear in Ezekiel, were read only figuratively as angels.) But the Bible also states that angels are also *spiritus* (Heb. 1:14). Do the angels who appear as some form of man actually have bodies and eat, or do they assume bodies temporarily, or do they simply generate phantasms? Most of the early Fathers argued that the angels did have some form of natural body, aethereal or fiery. Pseudo-Dionysius seems to have been the first Christian to have argued for the pure spirituality of the angels (Jewish traditions around the time of Christ

---

[41] Compare Bonaventure, *II Sent.* d. 4, a. 1, q. 2, conc. (2, 134), and Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.62.3.

[42] *Leg. maj.* 6.6.

[43] *Serm.* (9, 369).

[44] *II Sent.* d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, conc. (2, 260).

asserted this same belief).[45] But how does the understanding of "spirit" intersect with the useful philosophical categories of "form" and "matter"?

The assertion that all creatures, even angels, are composed of both form and matter (the doctrine of hylomorphism) stands at the heart of the Seraphic Doctor's understanding of the angelic nature. Both in his earliest scholastic work, the *Commentary on the Sentences*, and in his final theological synthesis, the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, hylomorphism represents a cornerstone of Bonaventure's entire metaphysics of angelology. While the belief that all creatures are composed of form and matter found its first major proponent in Avicebron (ca. 1020–ca. 1070), and Bonaventure's mentor, Alexander of Hales, had taught that spiritual matter existed, the Seraphic Doctor's formal point of departure for his discussion of hylomorphism is Lombard' statement that the angels have a "simple essence."[46]

Bonaventure rigorously applies the new Aristotelian metaphysical tools to the question of what it might mean to have a simple essence. For him, the problem is not a question of defining the simplicity or the indivisibility of the angelic nature; he examines the question from the other perspective—how does a theologian account for spatial, intellectual, volitional, or other changes in a creature as subtle as an angel? Thus the first question he asks about simple essence strikes at the very heart of the issue: "It is therefore first asked whether angels are composed of diverse natures, that is, out of matter and form."[47]

The first argument of the *fundamenta* derives from the principle that angels are mutable. Here, as the editors of the Quaracchi text indicate, Bonaventure is perhaps paraphrasing Augustine's declaration that all creatures are capable of change. Then, working from arguments of Aristotle, Boethius, and Augustine, Bonaventure next advances the proposition that matter is the principle of change. Since angels are creatures and are capable of change, and since all change is in the material component of a creature, then it follows that angels are composed of matter. Here Bonaventure draws together both Christian and pagan sources; for him both traditions, when properly understood, can inform Christian angelology.

---

[45] For Pseudo-Dionysius, see *Celestial Hierarchy* 2.2–3 and 4.2–3.

[46] Lombard, *Sentences* II, d. 3, p. 1, c. 1. Bonaventure's discussion of hylomorphism appears primarily in *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, 1. 1–3 (2, 88–102). For a lengthier discussion of Bonaventure and hylomorphism, see my *Angels and Angelology*, 93–99 and notes.

[47] *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1 (2, 89).

The second reason Bonaventure advances in favor of his position is that the metaphysical concepts of active and passive as constituent elements of the angelic nature can be accounted for only by the presence of matter in the angels. Here, working from the same principles as Avicebron, Bonaventure follows Aristotle and observes that the active principle of a creature is form and the passive principle is matter. Therefore, angels are hylomorphic. Bonaventure defends his statement that angels are both active and passive by citing the fact that "angels receive and give illuminations." Angels communicate with each other and with human beings by actively conveying an illumination to the recipient, who is in the state of passively receiving the message. As Bonaventure develops the argument that explains activity and passivity in angels, he responds to a potential counterargument. If it were to be stated that angels mediate illuminations in the way that light passes through the medium of air, he would reject it because there is no cooperation in the air's transmission of light. Bonaventure's concern for the personhood of the angels (his stress on the idea of cooperation) is important for him because he wishes to keep these abstract impersonal and metaphysical considerations as close as possible to the reality of personal angels. The reflection on the metaphysical components of angels is one part of the theologian's attempt to understand how angels communicate their revelations to humanity. The question of the angelic nature appears in the context of a formal academic text, but the larger context of Bonaventure's reflections on this question is the question of understanding the mechanics of the economy of salvation.

His *conclusiones* develop the basic metaphysical principles enunciated in the *fundamenta*. He begins by stating that angels cannot be simple in the sense that they are free from all compositions. Only God can be free from all composition. A creature, simply by virtue of its dependence on a creator, cannot be an absolutely simple being. Further, when considered from the perspective of being itself, all creatures are composites of activity and passivity (only God is pure act). Thus, it seems clear to the Seraphic Doctor that the angels are composite creatures. Questions remain, however; how are they composite, or in what sense are they simple? Bonaventure observes that angels are not composed of heterogeneous elements, nor are they composites of corporeal and spiritual natures, as are humans. He acknowledges that there are doubts about hylomorphism, observing that some people wish to except the angels from this doctrine while admitting of the compositions he has just listed. The Seraphic Doctor then critiques this position: "I do not see a cause or a line of reasoning

through which it would be possible to defend anything but that angels are composed of diverse natures (. . .), and if they are composed of diverse natures, the two natures have modes of activity and potentiality, and thus of matter and form."[48]

Bonaventure thus argued for a kind of spiritual, non-corporeal matter as an intrinsic aspect of angelic existence. But when angels appear to men and women, they often manifest themselves in human form. Are the angels' apparent bodies apparitions, phantasms, real bodies assumed by angels, real bodies created by angels, or even something else? The Seraphic Doctor devotes six questions on the *Commentary on the Sentences* to the problems surrounding the angelic bodies. His conclusions are, for the most part, in agreement with those of others.[49]

Bonaventure states that angels do not have natural bodies, although they may assume them. Angels do indeed assume these bodies, not because they need to for their own sakes, but so that they can more properly and efficiently communicate and minister to men and women. When he then considers whether the body an angel assumes is a real body (expressed in metaphysical terms, the "form of a human body" and in biological terms "the complexity and complete organization of a human body"), he answers that such bodies are not true bodies but are *effigies*. For angels to create real human bodies would violate not only the divine economy but also the laws of nature. Bodies arrive by generation and maturation, not by spontaneous angelic creation. The next question then becomes what these bodies might be made of. He replies that the angels assume their bodies primarily from the air but also from other elements which are mixed in. This solution, which Bonaventure prefers to the belief that angelic bodies are made of roughly equal mixtures of elements, and to another view that these bodies are made solely of air, suggests to him the proper combination of tangible and aethereal characteristics which angels seem to have. He remains open to further suggestion, although he is prepared to defend his answer: "for the present, we are able to sustain this position." While Bonaventure examines these questions with a rigorous analysis, he is prepared to leave some questions undefined. The question of the composition of angelic bodies is to him, therefore, a question of significance but not a question which he must answer absolutely.

---

[48] *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1 (2, 91). For Aquinas' views on hylomorphism (a doctrine he rejected with regards to angels), see Collins, *Thomistic*, 42–74.

[49] *II Sent.* d. 8, p. 1, a. 1–3 (2, 209–224). For Aquinas, see *Summa Theologiae* 1.51.1–3.

Another pressing question concerning the angelic bodies is whether the bodies are capable of exercising "vegetative operations." Are the angels, when they are in their assumed bodies, for example, capable of eating or reproducing? Bonaventure cites the story from Gen. 6, the begetting of the giants, and he also refers to the popular story of the demonic parenthood of Merlin. It would seem that it is possible for spirits, in these cases, fallen angels, to procreate with humans. Bonaventure argues, however, that spirits are unable to create humans biologically. Demons beget children by assuming the form of a woman, having sexual intercourse with a man, preserving his semen, assuming the form of a man, and depositing the now-demonic semen into a woman. (Thus, the demons were the first to perform artificial insemination.) Similarly, the good angels do not actually eat food. They do consume victuals in some sense, but Bonaventure suggests enigmatically that this is for the benefit of humans. The Seraphic Doctor stresses that the angels do not deceive humans when they appear to have bodies and exercise functions such as eating. Angels are revealers, not deceivers. Finally, he asks whether the angels exercise any sensory or motor functions when they assume their bodies. Bonaventure states that they do exercise motor functions to move the bodies themselves, but the angels themselves do not receive sensory input from the organs of the bodies.

Angelic Personhood and Knowledge

If angels could resemble humans in body, could they also share with humans the quality of personhood? Or, in other words, do angels themselves have distinct persons? While the narratives in earlier books of scripture portray them as somewhat cold, impassive extensions of the deity, other texts reveal that they are capable of emotions and of individual knowledge. Daniel's interaction with angels, statements about Michael's special roles, Tobias' journey with Raphael, and Luke's narrative about Gabriel and the annunciation offer more personalized images of angels. At times Bonaventure speaks of the possibility of personal relationships with angels (especially when he describes Francis' devotion to the angels), and at other times, the angels and the characters are pure abstract deductions, the products of synthesizing scriptural data with Aristotelian and Augustinian principles. As his angelology unfolds, it becomes clear that the abstract beings of Genesis are more compatible with his Aristotelian principles, and the personal beings of later biblical texts are closer to Bonaventure's Augustinian orientation, to his devotional principles and

beliefs.[50] Nevertheless, for clerics such as Hugh of St Victor or Bonaventure who were dedicated both to speculation and spiritual formation, their philosophical or metaphysical questions and their devotional or religious questions are not to be divorced. Thus, the Seraphic Doctor, who drew on Hugh, identifies the religious correlates to the philosophical principles of angelic attributes such as personality.

> We must know that, at the very instant of their creation, the angels were endowed with four perfections: simplicity of essence; individuality of person; rationality (. . .) and freedom of choice (. . .). These four main attributes are accompanied by four others: virtuosity in action, dedication in service, acuteness in understanding, and immutability in the choice of either good or evil.[51]

Through the metaphysically and philosophically interpreted nature of the angels, Bonaventure firmly states that the angels perfectly perform their ministrations. Because of their nature, the angels are worthy of being trusted by the humans who seek their aid.

To explore the issues of angelic personhood, the Seraphic Doctor raises three questions: whether angels have individual personhood, whether such personhood is substantial or accidental, and whether form or matter accounts for individual personhood.[52] In contrast to the sources on hylomorphism (which were essentially metaphysical observations by Augustine and Aristotle), the sources and influences for Bonaventure's consideration of personhood are more varied, including not only philosophers, but also church fathers and scripture.

For Bonaventure, the concept of individual personhood was quite important (in this respect he is at home in his age's increased emphasis on distinctive personal qualities), and the question of the personhood of the angels was a similarly significant question. Did the guardian angel assigned to each individual possess any sort of individual personhood? Had God assigned impersonal agents to watch over the creation? In the first two arguments in favor of discrete personhood in the angels, Bonaventure incorporates Dan. 7:10 and an antiphon for the feast of All Saints, thereby connecting his academic exposition with the active life of the church. Further, he observes that the angels must have natural social and

---

[50] Compare the angels in the *Sermones*, for example, with the angels in the *Commentary on the Sentences*.

[51] *Brev.* 2.6 (trans., 86). For Hugh's discussion of the personhood of the angels, see *De Sacramentis* 1.5.8.

[52] *II Sent.*, d. 3, p. 1, a. 2, q. 1–3 (2, 102–110).

amicable affections for one another; it is impossible for him to imagine angels without such inclinations. Angels retained their distinct personhoods, yet their wills were perfectly aligned with each other and with God. The scholastic interest in the personhood of the angels was an attempt to ground this crucial devotional model for humans in metaphysics. Because they must have social affections, it follows that they must be individual in person. Thus, he concludes that angels are distinct in personhood but not in species (which, for Bonaventure, angels do share). This distinction is not a distinction of accident, but of substance. The individual identity of the angels is established at the metaphysical level. The dignity of personhood requires that its principle be established at the level of substance, the fundamental metaphysical unit. Finally, in good hylomorphic fashion, he concludes that the distinction between angelic persons arises from the actual conjunction of each angel's form with its matter.

Angelic epistemology is confused by the fact that angels, having no natural bodies, have no sensory organs. They do not see, feel, or smell. How, then, could they know? Further, do angels acquire knowledge in a way comparable to human epistemology, or were they perhaps created in such a way that they knew universals at the first moment of their creation (that is, they were created with innate species in their minds)? In the second part of his commentary on Lombard's Distinction 3 and in two articles of his commentary on Distinction 4, Bonaventure ventures far beyond the basic observations of the Master and methodologically proceeds through the intricate problems of angelic epistemology and the related question of angelic affection.

Bonaventure must account for two types of knowing, knowing the universal and knowing the particular. The first question Bonaventure asks is whether angels know through "innate species"; that is, do angels possess their knowledge of the universe by means of a direct apprehension of the universal forms of all things?[53] As intelligences, the angels think and know through the most perfect of epistemological units, the species. The question for Bonaventure is not whether they know through species, but rather whether God filled their minds with the species at the moment of their creation or whether they have acquired more species as time progresses. He argues that reason, sacred scripture, and philosophy all confirm the proposition that the species through which the angels know were created in their minds by God from the moment of their creation. Not only did

[53] See *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 2, a. 2, q.1 (2, 117–121) for the discussion of angelic epistemology.

God create the species of all things then created, but also the species of all things that would be created in the fullness of time.

What about the problem of singular things? This is a far more difficult problem, one complicated by the Aristotelian emphasis on particulars. For Bonaventure, the metaphysics of knowing establish that the act of knowledge involves both active and passive principles. The superiority of the angel is such that it is not dependent on corporeal creatures to bring its mind thus from potency to act. Angels know particulars by actively composing their innate species in such a way that they arrive at a full knowledge of particular objects. By combining the right species in the mind, it is possible to arrive at a knowledge of a particular object without sensory data. If an angel unites all the species that together are the constituent elements of any particular being, the spirit can arrive at a knowledge of any such being without ever "seeing" such an object. Throughout this entire investigation, Bonaventure's desire to understand how the universe works is apparent. He pursues epistemological intricacies as a natural scientist would explore the mechanical principles of entomology. The Seraphic Doctor seeks to know how the most sublime of creatures "work," how they function. He wants to understand the created universe as it functions at the summit. Furthermore, knowledge of such celestial epistemological workings was crucial because angels were very important for the transmissions of prayers to God, for reporting to God the sins of the errant, and for the guarding of individual souls.

The next question a prospective master would have to address in proceeding through Lombard's *Sentences* is the question of the angels' natural knowledge of God. For Bonaventure and many of his predecessors in the twelfth century, the central issue is the necessity of God's grace. The Seraphic Doctor declares that even the subtle minds of the angels are unable to know God's essence without his assistance. Another significant question of angelic knowledge is whether angels have any knowledge of future events. Bonaventure addresses this matter in two contexts. First, at the instant of their creation, the good angels did not have any foreknowledge of their blessedness (which the evil angels also lacked) before their confirmation.[54] Bonaventure stresses the equal knowledge of all the angels at the moment of creation in order to emphasize the nature of their free choice. Angels, he argues, can reveal certain knowledge of the future

[54] *II Sent.* d. 4, a. 2, q. 1 (2, 136).

to mortals (as in dreams or visions) but only because God so reveals this foreknowledge to the angels.[55]

Angelic Love, Joy, and Sorrow

Following the questions of angelic epistemology, Bonaventure completes his commentary on Lombard's Distinction 3 by considering the question of angelic affections, particularly the angelic love (*amor, diligo*) of God.[56] The Greek philosophers considered the intelligences to be purely rational beings; they did not seem to have affections at all. By contrast, for Christian considerations of angels, affections, however understood, could never be separated from the idea of angels. The seraphim who gave the church's liturgy the *Sanctus* were understood according to the meaning of their name as being aflame with love for God. And as rational creatures capable of knowing the divinity, the angels would also be capable of the highest of experiences, the love of God.

The first question Bonaventure asks concerning the natural love of the angels is whether their natural love for God is for God's sake or their own, and whether such love is above the love of all other things. He asserts that the wills and judgments of the angels were established by God in such a way that the angels, at the moment of their creation, were able to love God for their own sakes and above all things. Bonaventure's own examination of the angels' natural love can remind him of how men and women would have been able to love God had Adam and Eve not sinned. Because the good angels did not sin and because they have been confirmed by God's grace in their love of God, they are fitting creatures to inspire human hearts for the love of God. Thus, angelology was a central part of medieval "emotionology," the "collective emotional standards of a society."[57] One of the reasons why the angelic hierarchy can serve as a model for humanity's social order is that the heavenly hierarchy exists in a perfect concord and benevolence wherein superiors and inferiors all agree and all love one another. In a sermon, Bonaventure declares that the church should be just like this hierarchy, this well-ordered society.[58]

---

[55] *II Sent.* d. 7, p. 2, a. 1, q. 3 (2, 194–196).

[56] *II Sent.* d. 3, p. 2, a. 3, q. 1–2 (2, 124–128).

[57] Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *American Historical Review* 90 (1985): 813.

[58] *Serm.* (9, 628).

In addition to love, angels are also capable of joy (*gaudium*). As Lk. 15:10 revealed: "There is joy before the angels of God over one sinner who repents." So intense and perfect is this joy that angels sometimes are depicted as being at carefree, ebullient play. As with other aspects of the angelic nature, Bonaventure raises several questions about the nature and character of this joy.[59] Are angels capable of increasing the joy they already enjoy? Can this joy ever be decreased? Are the angels capable of sadness? Since angels are confirmed in their beatitude by grace, they enjoy the ceaseless love and enjoyment of God, and thus it would seem that the angelic joy could not be increased. Drawing on Lombard, Bonaventure draws two distinctions about general changes in joy. Bonaventure asserts that the more probable view is that the essential joy of the angels, the joy they possess through their confirmation, cannot at all be augmented. Their accidental joy, the joy they receive from the goodness and beauty of the creation, can increase both in intensity and in extent. This accidental joy can, in particular, be the product of well-done ministrations. Indeed, the context for the question of angelic joy is the question: Does a guardian angel's joy increase when its ward is beatified? In a sermon delivered on the Lukan passage concerning angelic rejoicing, Bonaventure repeats the same argument he uses here; his regular sermons provided occasions for him to disseminate his ideas about angels throughout his entire career. Similarly, in his last work, the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, he notes that because of their "matter," angels are capable of increasing their joy; a pure form would be incapable of any change whatsoever.[60]

But if an angel's ward does not enter heaven, will the angel experience sorrow or loss? Bonaventure responds that the joy of the angels is so perfect and so full that it is impossible for the angels to experience any sadness whatsoever. The angels, therefore, by their very existence, are capable of increasing their happiness but it is impossible for them to ever experience any loss of enjoyment.

If we recall that Stoics, too, spoke of the joy of the philosopher, then angels, in a limited sense, are Christianized Stoics. The true Stoic lives according to a rational understanding of his nature; he does not suffer from the uncontrollable drives of the passions. He does not suffer grief; rather, he enjoys the world and derives rational pleasure from contemplating it. The basis of such Stoic happiness or contentment is the acceptance

---

[59] *II Sent.* d. 11, a. 2, q. 2–3 (1, 285–289).

[60] For his sermon, see 9, 369b, and for the *Collationes*, see 4.12.

of the world as it is ordered and arranged by the providential forces of nature. In the Christian context, this is the providence of God. As the Stoics stressed the importance of duty, so did scholastics discuss the duties of the angels in regard to the creation. And angels, as Bonaventure observes, being purely rational creatures confirmed by grace, are incapable of the base passions such as those that lead to sins.[61] Without going too far, then, it might be possible to suggest that for Bonaventure, angels are Stoics in their affections, Aristotelians in their epistemologies and metaphysics, and Neo-Platonists in their hierarchy of being and illumination.

Where Angels Are and How Many

Because of these profound relationships between humans and angels, angelic location was not an abstract question of little relevance. On the contrary, understanding the subtle nature of how angels relate to a place was a responsibility the theologian must undertake in order to understand the world God has created. Bonaventure concludes from the biblical narratives of angels and humans that the faithful should not be the fearful: "For we have the Lord and angels about us."[62] Angels were fully a part of the physical space of the Middle Ages, and the problem of how angels naturally intersect with the temporal world of humanity required exploration.

The first question Bonaventure asks is whether a corporeal place can be the location for an angel at all.[63] If an angel is incorporeal, how can it be in a place defined by space? Bonaventure states that the proper ordering of creation dictates that angels exist in corporeal places (they reside primarily in the empyrean, the most noble of bodies). These places must be defined corporeally, because the angels are not absolutely simple, capable of containing all things yet remaining separate from all things (as God is). Angels can be only in one place at a time because their principle of individuation declares that they are always defined by a here and a now.

The final two questions examined in the Seraphic Doctor's examination of the spatial qualities of angels are the questions that together constitute the head of the pin problem: Is it possible for an angel to exist in a mathematical point (*in loco impartibili sive punctuali*)? Is it possible for

---

[61] *Serm.* (9, 628).

[62] *Hex.* 17.19 (trans., 262).

[63] The discussion of angelic location and motion occurs in *II Sent.* d. 2, p. 2. a. 2, q. 1ff. (2, 75–80). See also *II Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1 (2, p. 261).

several angels to be in the same place at the same time? Bonaventure states that a mathematical point is no place at all. Angels can exist in the tiniest of physical spaces, spaces that themselves can be made smaller and smaller, but the space cannot be so small as to be a mathematical point. (Such applications of mathematical concepts to angelology could not have occurred without the revival of interest in mathematics in the preceding centuries.) On the second question, Bonaventure reminds his students that the reason for ascribing angels a place is the principle of universal order. When considering the nature of places and the nature of spiritual creatures, Bonaventure finds no reason why several angels could not theoretically be in the same place. On the other hand, when he considers the requirements of universal order, Bonaventure concludes that it is not allowed for more than one angel to be in the same place.

But how many angels are there? Scripture reveals important clues about the number of God's angels. Jesus declares that should he pray to the Father, the Son would receive "more than twelve legions of angels" (Matt. 26:53). Heb. 12:22 states that the company of angels is "innumerable," and Rev. 5:11 numbers the angels in the "thousands of thousands." For different reasons, various theologians argued that the precise number remains incalculable (some, such as Hugh of St Victor, would argue that the number of angels and demons equals the number of people whom the spirits protect or tempt). For Bonaventure and other scholastics, the issue of the number the angels was important because of the teachings of the pagan philosophers and their commentators.[64] Aristotle and his followers had erred in positing that the number of the intelligences to be limited to the number of the celestial bodies, spheres, or orbs. Thus, Aristotle and Avicenna had estimated the number of intelligences to be about forty, and Algazel had stated that there were ten intelligences. Christian theologians agreed that the angels moved the heavens, but it would erroneous to move from such a fact to a calculation of the precise number of spirits. Clearly, such philosophical speculations contradict the revelation of scripture. Bonaventure himself argues for their innumerability.

The Angelic Hierarchies

Not only are there very many angels, there are also many designations for them. From early in the church's history, the traditional interpreta-

[64] For Bonaventure, see *II Sent.* d. 18, a. 2, q. 1, ad 6 (2, 447–448) and *Serm.* (9, 624). For Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.50.3. For Hugh of St Victor, see *De Sacramentis* 1.5.31–3. For Pseudo-Dionysius, see *Celestial Hierarchy* 14.

tion of biblical creatures such Seraphim, Thrones, Principalities, etc. was that they were all angels arranged in some sort of hierarchy. The concept of hierarchy as passed down from Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (and to a lesser extent from Augustine) provided medieval thinkers with what M.-D. Chenu has called a "total hypothesis," a framework for understanding everything, a framework comparable to evolution today.[65] Bonaventure develops his ideas of the Trinity, the angels, the church, human society, the creation as a whole, and the human soul all in the context of his understanding of hierarchy. That hierarchy and subordination were permanently enshrined in the order of things was underscored by Aquinas when he argued that the angels would remain in their hierarchies even after the Last Judgment.[66]

Bonaventure asserts that "the heavenly hierarchy is a model of the church militant." Thus, the hierarchy of Seraphim, Cherubim, etc. indicates the appropriate character of the hierarchy of pope, archbishops, etc. And elsewhere, he states that through the angels, "the church is hierarchized". Not only do the angels hierarchize the temporal church, they also stabilize it.[67] Appropriately, therefore, the Seraphic Doctor, like Bernard of Clairvaux and many others before him, delivered sermons on the angelic hierarchies to popes and cardinals. Bonaventure's defense of the mendicants likewise would draw on the celestial hierarchy and what it reveals about the place of Francis and the Franciscans (see below). The hierarchy of angels also offers Bonaventure a way of understanding the sinful, unhierarchized soul's progress as it journeys to God, and one of the highest epithets he bestows on Francis is the title, "hierarchic man".[68] Thus, as medieval thinkers contemplate the celestial hierarchy of the angels, they also contemplate the very structure of the Creator, the creation, the proper order of human society, and the restoration of humanity. A hierarchy in which an angel participates is "an ordered power, sacred

---

[65] M.-D. Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (Chicago: 1968), 82. See also Georges Duby, *The Three Orders* (Chicago: 1978), 110–119; Giles Constable, "The Orders of Society," in Idem, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought* (Cambridge 1995); and Carolyn Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: 1982), 82–109.

[66] Aquinas *Summa Theologiae*, 1.108.7.

[67] *Hex*., 22.2 (trans., 342) and 21.16 (trans., 328); *Serm.* (9, 613). See also 621b, 626b, and 627b.

[68] For the soul's hierarchical return to God, see *Itin.* 4.4. On Francis, see *Leg. maj*., Prologue. For addresses to popes, see, for example, the surviving notes to a sermon he delivered to Pope Clement IV and his cardinals in 9, 86–87. Note, too, that Bernard addressed his *On Consideration*, which contains some of his most important reflections on the angels and the church, to Pope Eugene III.

in nature and belonging to a rational being, by virtue of which a superior being legitimately dominates the beings subject to him."[69]

The angels' very arrangement of three sets of three orders within three hierarchies had Trinitarian intimations, which Bonaventure frequently explored (Aquinas argued against such readings because the Trinity does not exist in a hierarchy).[70] According to the Seraphic Doctor's understanding of the perfect poetry of the creation, the Trinity manifested itself in the very arrangement of the hierarchy of angels. And as the Trinity created the world, so too did it guide it; the operations and functions of the angels constituted one aspect of this divine providence. Meditations on these beings thus constituted what Bonaventure called the "splendid consideration of the heavenly hierarchy."[71]

Bonaventure recognizes the difficulties in speaking of the Principalities, Powers, etc. their characteristics, and their roles in the divine economy. In his *Commentary on the Sentences*, he prefaces his comments on the Master with *praenotata* which indicate his own uncertainty. Instead of proceeding via the *quaestio* and its structure, which Bonaventure calls the *via inquisitionis*, he prefers to discuss the hierarchies first through what he calls the *via narrationis*.[72] The subject of the hierarchies calls not for scholastic method but for a simple narration of what a hierarchy is and what the orders of angels are. Precisely because Scripture seemed ambiguous and reason seemed insufficient for examining the angelic orders, Bonaventure relied heavily on the near-apostolic authority of Paul's Athenian convert, Pseudo-Dionysius.[73]

According to the Areopagite, the angels exist in three distinct hierarchies, each of which contains three separate orders, and together they constitute the angelic hierarchy as a whole.[74] The arrangement of the angelic orders (in descending order) according to the Areopagite was:

---

[69] Matthew M. De Benedictis, *The Social Thought of Saint Bonaventure* (Westport, CT: 1972), 124. De Benedictis here offers what seems to be a good translation of the meaning of Bonaventure's own definition: *hierarchia est rerum sacrarum et rationabilium ordinata potestas, in subditis debitum retinens principatum*. *II Sent.* d. 9, praenotata (2, 238).

[70] See, for example, *II Sent.* d. 9, praenotata, and the entire 21st Collation of the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*. For Aquinas, see *Summa Theologiae*, 1.108.1.

[71] *Hex*. 20.3 (trans., 300).

[72] *II Sent.* d. 9, praenotata (2, 237).

[73] See *II Sent.* d. 9, a. 1, q. 4 (2, 249).

[74] Pseudo-Dionysius, *Celestial Hierarchy* 6.

First Hierarchy	Seraphim Cherubim Thrones	(the names derive from their relationship to God)
Second Hierarchy	Dominions Virtues Powers	(the names all suggest a common administration or disposition for ordering the universe)
Third Hierarchy	Principalities Archangels Angels	(the names derive from the performance of their duties)

For medieval theologians, the names of the various orders offered clues to the nature of their specific duties. As the meaning of the Greek word *aggelos* would signify the primary mission of the angels to be "messengers," so too would the meanings of each of the titles of angels suggest their primary roles and characteristics.

Bonaventure's treatment of each of the orders reveals that the Seraphic Doctor affirms the Areopagite's rigid system of the transmission of knowledge and duties (according to which the angels sent messages and assigned tasks through each of the orders from the Seraphim on down until the Angels received and implemented them). But he also has room for some direct points of contact between some higher orders of angels and the world of men and women (which had been a characteristic of Gregory the Great's view of the hierarchies, another authoritative source for understanding the hierarchies). Pseudo-Dionysius, for example, interpreted the meaning of "Principality" in ontological and epistemological terms, in terms of the Principality's inclination towards the divine Principle. Bonaventure saw in the title Principality the clue that these angels directly exercise duties over princedoms.[75]

The Individual Orders

Franciscans had a special reason for meditations on the Seraphim of Is. 6:2–7 (their only appearance in Scripture). Not only is a seraph the highest and most sublime of God's creatures, but also a seraph, or perhaps Christ in the form of a seraph, was the central figure in the validation of St. Francis (see below). Thus, as with other Franciscans, Bonaventure

[75] *II Sent.* d. 9, praenotata (2, 241).

speculates on the nature and hidden significance of these beings.[76] They have three sets of wings and their name signifies fire, but what do such things mean? Captivated by their mysteries, he entitled an entire treatise *On the Six Wings of the Seraph*,[77] and references to the liturgical seraphic cry, "Holy! Holy! Holy!" punctuate his writings as the model for creaturely appreciation of the divine. He sees in the three sets of wings the descent and ascent of Christ. In the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, he utilizes the six wings of the Seraphim to provide different ways of understanding God and God's nature. And the wings also serve as a way of discussing how "all creatures of this sensible world lead the soul of the wide beholder toward the eternal God."[78]

The Cherubim signify essentially knowledge of God (their name signifies fullness of knowledge or wisdom, and they were often depicted with wings full of eyes, following Ezek. 10:12). Bonaventure notes that each of the different orders possesses all of the qualities and virtues in degrees appropriate to their rank, but each particular order receives its title because it is associated with that particular quality.[79] Thus, every angel, not just the Seraphim and Cherubim, also possesses a love of, as well as knowledge of, God. Bonaventure associates the attribute of steadfastness with the Thones (by contrast, Bernard associates them with supreme tranquility). God judges the world through these particular angels.[80] The Seraphic Doctor does not elaborate on how God and the Thrones do this; he merely states that these particular angels are part of the divine process of judgment.

The second hierarchy suggests "ordained power"; thus, the Dominions preside, the Virtues operate (by performing miracles, among other things), and the Powers repel harmful forces (usually demons). If this explanation seems vague, it is because medieval language itself, on this point, is vague. Bonaventure states that "*virtus imperativa* (. . .) *ad Dominationes* (. .)

---

[76] Thomas of Celano, one of the authors Bonaventure used when he wrote his own biography of Francis, also speculated on the meaning of the six wings of the Seraphim. See 1C 114–115 in FA:ED 1, 281–283.

[77] Although the authenticity of *De sex alis Seraphim* is questioned, the work is certainly inspired by Bonaventure's thought.

[78] For his use of the seraphic cry, see, for example, *De regimine animae* 2 (which was addressed to St Louis' daughter, Blanche), and *Hex.* 2.5, 8.7–19, and 21.24. For his mystical reading of the wings, see *Itin.* 2.11 (trans., 26).

[79] See, for example, Bonaventure, *Brev.* 2.8, and Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.108.5.

[80] *II Sent.* d. 9, praenotata (2, 240) and Bernard, *On Consideration* 5.4.8. See also *Serm.* (9, 610).

spectat": "the power to command (. . .) pertains to the Dominions."[81] The verb *specto* is hardly precise. He does not detail these angelic powers or functions at all. He seems to be associating qualities and abstract forces with the titles of the angels. One of the reasons why he preferred to explain the orders of angels in his *praenotata* and not in a *quaestio* was, perhaps, because he did not think he could go beyond these basic associations. Medieval exegesis of the angels thus can appear, at times, quite loose and unspecified. Bonaventure, for example, frequently uses the verb *tango* to explain the significance of Scriptural passages. A story or a word "touches" upon some other meaning or some other passage. Thus God's smiting of the proud in Job 26:12 "touches the Powers."[82] Bonaventure, it seems, does not want to state explicitly that God chastises the proud through the Powers; rather, he is content merely to suggest some vague but extant connection. The verb *tango* is sufficiently imprecise to allow medieval exegetes to establish a relationship without actually defining the relationship itself.

Widely accepted medieval views were that the Principalities are responsible for the wise governance of the kingdoms of the world; the Archangels direct multitudes of people, and the Angels are responsible for being the guardian angels of individuals. Alternatively, in one of his sermons, Bonaventure states that the Principalities lead humans into beatitude, the Archangels teach hidden things, and the Angels guard, comfort, and support humans.[83] He sees different understandings and different uses for the orders of angels, and he freely explores alternative meanings which the angelic titles suggest.

Archangels are in many respects the most important rank of angels for humanity, but biblical uses of the actual term occur infrequently, only in 1 Thess. 4:16 and Jude 9 (which identifies Michael specifically as an archangel). In addition to declaring that Archangels preside over multitudes of people, medieval theologians also assign these angels the task of delivering crucial messages, such as in the annunciation, to men and women.[84] The order of Archangels is the only order which has names for some of its members. Traditionally, Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael were seen to be Archangels (from the eighth century, Uriel, who appears in only briefly

---

[81] *Brev.* 2.8 (5, 226).

[82] "*per 'percussionem superbi' tangit Potestates* (. . .)": *Serm.* (9, 611). For other examples of Bonaventure's use of *tango* in his sermons on the angels, see 613 and 622.

[83] See, for example, *Brev.* 2.8. See also *II Sent.* d. 9, praenotata (2, 241) and *Serm.* (9, 612).

[84] Cf. *Brev.* 2.8.

in 2 Esdras, was no longer seen to be a sufficiently orthodox figure to be accepted and commented upon with the others). As each of the titles of the orders suggest the functions of the order, so too do the names of the Archangels provide clues for the exegete. Following the traditional understanding of the translation of their Hebrew names, Bonaventure interprets Michael to mean "He who is as God," Gabriel as "Fortitude of God," and Raphael as "Medicine of God."[85]

Whereas commentaries on the *Sentences* or *Summae Theologiae* were the scholastic vehicles for expounding on the meaning of the hierarchies, sermons, especially those delivered on the feast of St Michael, remained the most important context for explorations of the named Archangels. Thus, Bonaventure in one such sermon, allegorically reading the story of Raphael's healing miracles in the Book of Tobit, identifies Raphael with a triple medicine for sin—with compunction, remembrance of the passion of Christ, and prayer.[86] The Seraphic Doctor associates Gabriel with certain virtues. Because of Gabriel's perfect embodiment of reverence, purity, concord, and mercy, he was sent to the Virgin. Through him and the rest of the angels, these virtues can arise in humans. As with his discussion of the functions of the orders, he does not develop this process in detail; the sermons are more for hortatory than explanatory purposes.[87] Finally, Michael escorts the departed soul and presents it to God (see Jude 9), and he also serves as the protector of the church. This last function had been suggested by Dan. 10:21, where the Archangel seems to be the guardian angel of Israel. As the church replaced Israel as the people of God, so did Michael's protection come to extend to the church. Faithful to the tradition of Michael as a powerful patron for Christian warriors, Bonaventure can also recall for his listeners that Michael would indeed be on their side in warfare.[88] In one of his sermons, Bonaventure explains the relevance of these archangels for humans and rhetorically asks why Raphael and Gabriel do not have their own feast days.[89] Clearly, Bonaventure recognizes their importance in the divine economy, and he further laments the fact that as far as the entire celestial hierarchy is concerned, "Indeed there are many well-known, great clerics who are not able to name the orders of angels. And, what is even worse, they are not able to say the basic tenets

---

[85] Cf. *Serm.* (9, 625).
[86] *Serm.* (9, 625–626).
[87] "*et per eos* [*Angelos*] *in nobis, quantum* [*fieri*] *potest*": *Serm.* (9, 627).
[88] *Serm.* (9, 617b).
[89] *Serm.* (9, 625).

concerning how many orders there are and what they are like (. . .). There is great negligence!"[90]

Finally, the title of Angel appears frequently in the Vulgate, as *aggelos* served as a translation of the Hebrew *mal'akh*, also meaning "messenger." Bonaventure concurs with the rest of the theological tradition that they are responsible for delivering those messages which are not as lofty and significant as the communications which the Archangels transmit. As the most immediate of the angels as far as humans are concerned, the Angels, however, must serve many important tasks, especially that of being the guardian angels of individuals.

Guardian Angels

Following the patristic reading of Matt. 18:10, Acts 12:15, and Tob. 3:25, as influenced by Greek ideas about personal daemons, medieval theologians asserted that God has ordained an angel to watch over the welfare of each individual soul. The Seraphic Doctor believed that from the very moment of conception, a human being and his or her guardian angel are connected. God appoints a guardian angel to preside over a person as soon as the new creature comes into existence. Because he believes that a soul is capable of being tempted by the demons even in the womb, he argues that an angel must guard the soul of a person as soon as it is created into the womb. Aquinas, by contrast, concentrated on the use of reason as the central issue involving cooperation with a guardian angel. He argued that a guardian angel was not appointed until birth, the time at which being a rational creature begins (he also rejects baptism as the moment of receiving the angel, a view held by, for example, Peter Damian). Until then, the mother's angel appropriately protected the fetus, as the two humans were not yet separated.[91] Such theological reflection indicates not only a passionate desire for knowing as much as can be known about the divine economy, but also a recognition that the debates about guardian angels are important for the soteriological fate of human beings.

In his explanation of the doctrine of these spirits, Bonaventure responds to a number of possible arguments against the existence of guardian angels that the thirteenth-century's focus on human nature and natural merit raised. He argues that the assistance of these angels does not affect

[90] *Serm.* (9, 625a).

[91] Compare Bonaventure, *II Sent.* d. 11, dub. 1, and Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.13.5. For Peter Damian, see *Opusculum* 23.4.

human free will, nor does having a guardian angel diminish the merit of the saints.[92] The assistance of these angels does aid human effort, but the spiritual rewards of correct moral choices remain. Similarly, the doctrine does not diminish the importance of God in human salvation, since God is present in the angels' work. The guardian angels cannot save or redeem humanity, but they can cooperate with a person's own spiritual efforts. The angels perform this ministry partly because of their love for God and partly because of their desire to see the salvation of humans and the reparation of the angelic hierarchies. The Seraphic Doctor's doctrine of guardian angels, then, exemplifies the new understanding of the harmony of nature and grace characteristic of thirteenth-century scholasticism.

The guardian angels represented to medieval Christians the perpetual possibility of divine aid. Consequently, a question of great soteriological significance is whether a person's obstinacy can cause the guardian angel to abandon him or her. If a person can lose the angel, can he or she still be saved? Bonaventure reveals his intense horror at the thought of betraying the angels in his *Soliloquy*:

> When I look upon my sin in the proper light, I see and realize that, in my iniquity, I perverted the elements, befouled the skies, darkened the heavenly bodies, tormented the reprobate in hell, offended the saints in heaven, spurned the angels in charge of my soul in such a way that I am afraid to ask them for help.[93]

In this passage, Bonaventure identifies the guardian angels of his soul (here in the plural, suggesting perhaps the entire hierarchy of angels, even though the order of Angels was the order assigned as guardians) with the creation and the saints as part of the gifts of God that the reprobate denies and disgraces. Both he and Aquinas, however, affirm that a person cannot lose his or her guardian angel; even the sinner is unable to turn away the gracious assistance of the angels.[94] (Nor does excommunication from the church's sacraments drive the guardian angel away, the Seraphic Doctor argues.) The guardian angel thus offered the undying hope of the gracious assistance of God. Ultimately, for most medieval Christians, the crucial attribute of the guardian angels is this perpetual hope for salvation that transcends the weakness of the will.

---

[92] *II Sent.* d. 11, a. 1, q. 1, sol.
[93] *Solil.* 26 (trans., 61).
[94] *II Sent.* d. 11, a. 2, q. 1, and Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1.113.6.

Apocalyptic Angelology at the End of Bonaventure's Life

Bonaventure developed the angelology described above in many contexts for a variety of purposes. In his final work, the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, he formulates his angelology as part of his response to the ongoing turmoil of the Franciscan order.

He ultimately abandons the traditional Franciscan view of angels as a model for the active-contemplative life in favor of another model, also derived from angels. He replaces the image of the ministering and praying hierarchy of angels and Franciscans with an image of the highest of the angels, the Seraphim. No longer does he encourage his fellow friars to pursue both lives. Rather, he presents the ardent six-winged Seraphim and recommends their life of ceaseless prayer and ecstasy as the model for the order of Francis (and indeed for the whole church). He replaces the angel's duality of activity and prayer with the seraphim's ceaseless prayers of "Holy, holy, holy" for two reasons. First, his own personal religious inclinations were always primarily contemplative, speculative, and even mystical. Thus, in his *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, Bonaventure's most direct exposition of his own spirituality, he seems hardly interested in the active life. Bonaventure envisions the contemplative, heavenly life as liberating. Quoting Augustine, he declares that in the celestial realm, human bodies, knowledge, and love will all be perfect; although humans will not be as old as the angels, they will share the spirits' unbridled joy.[95] The Seraphic Doctor's primary attraction to the angels had always been the vision of the purity and splendor of the angels of eternal contemplation.

The second reason for advocating a life of pure contemplation came not from his personal desires but from his own experiences as the chief administrator of the Friars Minor. After serving as minister general of the order for sixteen years, he had come to see his order not in terms of the church militant (which required the Franciscans to combine activity and contemplation), but in terms of the of Apocalypse (which, as he read it, called for a life of pure contemplation and ecstasy). The order, threatened from within by what was becoming the Spiritual wing of the order (members of which were employing angelology in dangerous fashions) and from without by the secular clergy, had a special mission to reform the church. As Bonaventure perceived the crises of his order and the contemporary church, the prophecies of the Apocalypse seemed ready to be

[95] *Solil.* 4.20.

fulfilled. Indeed, the entire order, influenced directly or indirectly by the prophecies of Joachim of Fiore, was engaged in apocalyptic reflections.

The Joachite legacy compelled the Franciscans to explore the subject of the angels, because Joachim himself had explored the hidden significance of the angels of the Apocalypse. As Bonaventure assumed the position of minister general, his order and the church were questioning who Francis was and what his relationship was to the angels of the Apocalypse. Was Francis, in fact, one of the angels of the Apocalypse, as some maintained? Had Joachim of Fiore correctly interpreted the angels of the Apocalypse and predicted the advent of the Dominicans and Franciscans? Had he accurately prophesied that in 1260 the old church was to be superseded by the new church of the mendicants? The Franciscans developed their ideas about Francis, themselves, and the angels within the context of these questions. For the Seraphic Doctor, the ideas of Joachim of Fiore set the agenda for an exploration of the angels of the Apocalypse and their relationship to Francis and the order.[96]

In the *Legenda major*, Bonaventure had sought to establish Francis' identity tactically relative to the dangerous speculations and criticisms from within and without the order, and his angelology was an important feature of establishing who Francis really was. In order to utilize the life of Francis to define the nature and mission of the order, the Seraphic Doctor establishes three specific connections with angels. Francis is seraphic; he is the angel of peace; and above all, he is the sixth angel of the Apocalypse. Together, these angelic references allow Bonaventure to respond to the dangerous groups threatening his order.

The Prologue refers to Francis as a man "wholly ignited by seraphic fire."[97] Central to the demonstration of Francis's special calling and central to Bonaventure's understanding of angels was the encounter between Francis and the seraph on Mount Alverna. No other founder of an order had been so holy and so favored by God that he had received the actual wounds of the Savior. He had received a "singular privilege which had never before been conceded to a person in all the previous ages."[98] The authority and mission of the order of Friars Minor rested on this event, and the dangers of his own era seemed to demonstrate the eschatological importance of this event.

---

[96] For a more thorough discussion of these issues as well as bibliographic resources, see my *Angels and Angelology*, ch. 7.

[97] *Leg. maj.*, Prologue.

[98] *Leg. maj* (8, 549).

Throughout his writings as minister general, he returns to Francis's vision of the seraph and its significance. In his Prologue, he claims that he derived the basis for the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* from his own contemplation of the event during his own climb of Mt Alverna. Indeed, the six wings of the seraphim and what they signify become the foundation for his exposition of how the mind can reach God. Moreover, in April 1263, before the General Chapter of that year, he may have composed his *Six Wings of the Seraphim*, a treatise for religious superiors. Each of the six wings, he argues, suggests an important virtue for the leaders of the church's institutions. He identifies these virtues as the zeal for justice, kindness, patience, an exemplary life, provident discernment, and devotion to God. The six-winged seraph, so crucial to the story of Francis, points to a revitalization of the church hierarchy. Ultimately, in the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, the figure of Francis and his encounter with the seraph assume eschatological significance; the seraphic encounter becomes the key to Bonaventure's final understanding of church history and the salvation of all humanity.

In the second major angelic identification of Francis in the Prologue to the *Legenda major*, Bonaventure echoes Is. 33:7 and identifies Francis as the "Angel of true peace." In several other sections, Bonaventure similarly portrays Francis as a man who brings peace and triumphs over discord. By stressing Francis' calm, non-contentious ways, Bonaventure indirectly and gently rebukes the Spirituals for the discord they had brought to the rder.

Finally, the third and most provocative of Bonaventure's angelic identifications of Francis in the Prologue is his linking of Francis and an angel of the Apocalypse, specifically the sixth angel (Rev. 7:2–4).[99] (Bonaventure's source for identifying Francis as the sixth angel was probably Gerard of Borgo San Donino and John of Parma.) That Francis had signed all of his letters with the "T," had identified himself with Ezek. 9:4 (those to be saved in Jerusalem will bear this sign), and has been marked by God's own seal, the stigmata, all pointed to this identity of Francis as the angel of Rev. 7:2, an identity which the Seraphic Doctor argues for in several texts, especially the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*.[100]

---

[99] *Leg. maj.*, Prologue.

[100] *Perf. evang.* q. 2, a. 3, ad 12 (5, 164); *Leg. maj.*, Prologue 1 and 2 and 13.10; and *Hex.* 16.16.

The Collationes in Hexaemeron

As Bonaventure senses the possibility of an imminent eschatological revolution in the church, he anticipates the eternal repose of the church triumphant. In this ultimate summation of his work, the Seraphic Doctor offers the culmination of his thinking on the most important elements of theology and the church.[101] Indeed, the *Hexaemeron* contains Bonaventure's collations on angels. All of the principal themes of his lifelong reflections on angels reappear in these sermons. (He even retracts some of his previous angelological errors.)[102] His love of anagogy and the angelic hierarchies, his metaphysical investigations of the spirits of heaven, the symbiosis of angelology and ecclesiology, the consideration of the mysterious six-winged seraphim—all of these themes permeate the text. Several of the sermons contain extended reflections on the angelic hierarchies, their relationship to the Trinity, and their relationship to the church. Further, for the first time he reveals that he has conversed with an angel, apparently one of the Virtues.[103] At approximately the age of fifty-six, the Seraphic Doctor integrates his angelology. He now places this synthesis in the context of his apocalyptic reflections on the crises of the contemporary church. Now more than ever, the study of the angels and the triumph of the church militant become inseparable.

In the twenty-second collation of the *Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure uses the nine orders of angels to analyze and interpret the nine grades of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.[104] Throughout the *Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure employs angels and the angelic hierarchies as figures, types, or symbols that help to fathom the nature of the church and her contemporary dilemmas, and in this particular passage, he reveals his final thoughts on Francis, the Franciscans, angels, and the Apocalypse. He divides the nine orders of each into three groups: the active, those who combine active and contemplative lives, and those who are pure contemplatives. Thus laypeople, those most concerned with temporal affairs, correspond to the

---

[101] For a rich discussion of this complex text, see Colt Anderson's *A Call to Piety: St. Bonaventure*'s Collations on the Six Days (Quincy, IL: 2002). Anderson argues for a nuanced approach to Bonaventure's understanding of the angelic hierarchies and what they suggest for the ordering of the earthly church. In particular, he stresses Bonaventure's emphasis on the virtue of stability—associated with the Thrones and with the order of the patriarchs—and discerns in this elevated emphasis Bonaventure's strategy for negotiating the proper, orthodox status of the Franciscans in the church militant.

[102] *Hex.* 21.32.

[103] *Hex.* 21.20.

[104] *Hex.* 22.18–23.

lowest orders of angels: the Angels, Archangels, and Principalities. Clerics, who must minister to laypeople as well as pray, correspond to the middle order of angels: the Powers, Virtues, and Dominions. Finally, the religious occupy the highest triad, and here Bonaventure reveals his ultimate views on the roles of Francis and the Franciscans in the economy of salvation.

Bonaventure identifies the traditional monastic orders with the Thrones, for both approach God by supplication. He links the Franciscans (and Dominicans) with the Cherubim. The name of this order signifies "fullness of knowledge" and Bonaventure argues that the Franciscans and the Cherubim share speculation, study, and knowledge as their road to God. Finally, in a curious and ambiguous passage, Bonaventure identifies Francis with the Seraphim:

> The third manner [of contemplation] is concerned with those who attend to God by means of elevation, that is, through ecstasy and rapture. And he [Bonaventure] said, what is this? This is the Seraphic order. It seems that Francis belonged to it. And he [Bonaventure] said that he [Francis] was in ecstasy before even receiving the habit, . . . This indeed is the most difficult, that is elevation, for the whole body is shaken, and unless there be some consolation of the Holy Spirit, it could not survive. And in these things the church is consummated. But what this order is to be, or already is, it is hard to know (. . .). This order will not flourish unless Christ appears and suffers in His mystical body. And he [Bonaventure] said that this apparition of the Seraph to Blessed Francis (. . .) showed that this order was to correspond to this one [the Seraph], but that Francis was to attain it through hardships.[105]

Only Francis is truly seraphic, truly capable of being rapt in seraphic ecstasies; only he is worthy of being an apocalyptic angel. Only he, not his order, is capable of showing the church the way from the church militant to the church triumphant.

The Franciscans are cherubic not only because they do not share Francis's gifts, but also because they have receded from their former practices. For the Seraphic Doctor, the Franciscans of his age were hardly worthy of being seraphic. While the earliest followers of Francis led unquestionable lives, Bonaventure recognized the failings of his own generation, the second, of Franciscans. In a letter to the ministers of the chapters circulated on his election in 1257, Bonaventure lists the problems with the order. Franciscans suffered from idleness, instability, excessive begging, and too much concern for developing sources of revenue (such as performing

[105] *Hex.* 22.22–3 (trans., 352).

burials).[106] Although he was a vigorous defender of the order, he was also a blunt critic.

Thus, thoroughly orthodox in his apocalyptics, he confirms the value of the existing church while simultaneously hinting at its transformation. Because of the coming of Francis, he can in fact expect that there will be a seraphic order, and in this new mode of spiritual existence, "the church is consummated." Nevertheless, he states, "But what this order is to be, or already is, is hard to know." The vision of the six-winged seraph clearly contains the clues to understanding the fulfillment of the church, but he concludes indecisively, "In this vision, there were great mysteries."[107] Ultimately Bonaventure does not present his definitive views. His ideas remain elusive. Toward the end of his life, he is still struggling with angelic mysteries. Protected by his guardian angel from the time he was in his mother's womb, he continues to pursue the angels and their significance with passionate curiosity even as he draws closer to the time when they will bear his soul into heaven.

[106] *Epist.* (8, 468–469).
[107] *Hex.* 22.23 (trans., 352).

BONAVENTURE: ON THE INSTITUTION OF SACRAMENTS

J.A. Wayne Hellmann

Christ instituted three sacraments, not seven. In this textual study of bk. 4 of Bonaventure's *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*,[1] this is what I will argue. Later, in part 6 of his *Breviloquium*,[2] as will be noted in the conclusion, he articulates this position differently, but he nevertheless brings forward the insights of his earlier thinking as articulated in the *Commentary*.

To begin, however, Bonaventure agrees that there are seven sacraments in the New Law.[3] He accepts the list of "seven sacraments," which first appeared in 1147 in the anonymous *Sententiae divinitatis*, a text formed in the school of Gilbert of Poitiers.[4] This number moved forward when Peter Lombard, a contemporary, picked up on the number "seven" and utilized it for his collection of *Sententiae* (1158). After Alexander of Hales introduced Peter's compilation into the curriculum of the friars in Paris, it became a common textbook. Budding theologians, including Bonaventure, therefore commented on the number seven. The enumeration of seven sacraments subsequently gained universal acceptance.[5]

---

[1] After completion of his study of and lecturing on Sacred Scripture, Bonaventure began his exposition on *The Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard* in 1250. For a contemporary survey of Lombard's treatment of sacraments, see Thomas M. Finn, "The Sacramental World in the Sentences of Peter Lombard," *Theological Studies* 69 (2008): 557–582.

[2] The *Breviloquium* is commonly dated by most scholars to 1257.

[3] For a concise overview of sacramental theology in the Middle Ages, see James Ginther, "Sacraments," in *The Westminster Handbook to Medieval Theology* (Louisville, KY: 2009), 161–162. For a more comprehensive treatment, see Marilyn McCord Adams, "Sacraments: What, Why, and Wherefore," in *Some Later Medieval Theories of the Eucharist* (New York: 2010), ch. 2. For an introduction to Bonaventure's sacramental theology in particular, see Michael J. Higgins, "The Sacramental Theology of St. Bonaventure," *Review for Religious* 47 (1988): 284–292.

[4] Cf., Dominic Monti, ed. and trans., *Breviloquium*, (Works of St. Bonaventure) 9 (Saint Bonaventure, NY: 2005), 218 n. 22.

[5] This number of seven later appeared in official magisterial teaching at the Council of Lyon in 1274: *Tenet etiam et docet eadem sancta Romana Ecclesia, septem esse ecclesiastica sacramenta* (DS 860). Then again, two hundred years later, the Council of Florence in 1439 repeated the number of seven, but further identified these seven as being of the New Law: *Novae Legis septem sunt sacramenta* (DS 1310). Florence offered something new. It did not simply list the seven sacraments like Lyon, but it briefly commented on each one of them. In both councils, the number seven is clear, but in neither council is there any comment

In the *Commentary on the Sentences*, before Bonaventure actually comments on the number seven, he first argues that there must be several or even many sacraments: "Many indeed because they are for frequent training and only one would give rise to aversion. Many also because their purpose is instruction and one only would give rise to ambiguity."[6] He adds: "Although an easier way would consist in one [sacrament], it would not be as fitting as in many (*quia non ita congrua ut in pluribus*). Thus, they are many."[7]

From arguing that there must be many sacraments, he moves to argue that there are seven and not more: "Furthermore, they are seven and not more because they serve as medicine, and because medicines apply to the wounds they heal. Then by healing wounds it [a sacrament] assists the virtues, and in assisting the virtues it arms and defends against infirmities."[8]

Seven virtues are another reason why sacraments are numbered at seven. And again within the same *respondeo*, when Bonaventure ponders varied purposes for the sacraments, he develops yet another reason for the number seven. These include the following: training, instruction, healing, aid to virtues, and armor or weapons. He similarly concludes: "Thus it is clear that they are only seven, whether they are considered as medicinal, or as helps, or as arms for battle."[9]

In other words, Bonaventure accepts the number seven for the sacraments because this number is simply fitting (*ita congrua*) in view of their

---

on how or by whom these were instituted. (Texts cited from Henricus Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum De Rebus Fidei et Morum* [Rome: 1976].)

[6] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad resp. (4, 53). All citations from Bonaventure's *Commentary on the Sentences* are from the critical edition: *S. Bonaventura Opera Omnia*, 10 vols. (Quaracchi: 1882–1902). Translations of these texts are taken from a draft in preparation for publication by the Franciscan Institute (Saint Bonaventure). The texts were initially translated by Peter Nickels OFM Conv. and then revised and edited by J.A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and Timothy Lecroy.

[7] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad obj. 1 (4, 53).

[8] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad obj. 1 (4, 53). Here in this same *respondeo*, Bonaventure further explains: "In as much as the sacraments are an aid to the virtues, the number is arrived at in this way: as an aid to faith, such as Baptism, which is the gate to the sacraments as faith is to the virtues; an aid to hope, such is Extreme Unction; an aid to charity, such is the Eucharist, which unites and incorporates; an aid to prudence, which is Orders; an aid to justice, which Penance is; an aid to temperance, Matrimony; an aid to fortitude, Confirmation." In this enumeration of seven virtues as a reason for seven sacraments, Bonaventure follows Alexander of Hales, who utilizes the same seven virtues, although in a different order. Cf. Alexander, *Summa*, pars 4, q. 5, m. 7, a. 1–2.

[9] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad obj. 1 (4, 53).

purpose and in view of the wisdom of God. Not once in his consideration of this number does he hold that there are seven sacraments because Christ instituted seven. This is never given as a reason for the number seven. However, he does root the sacraments in the passion of Christ, and he gives this as another reason why there are many sacraments, at least more sacraments than the eucharist. The effects of the passion of Christ cannot be contained within only one sacrament: "that although the passion is signified in the eucharist, and Christ is contained in it, in whom there is the fullness of grace, the passion is still not signified to all of its effects in every sacrament, nor is the fullness of grace contained [in the eucharist] for the purpose of providing every grace, but particularly for the effect of a meal."[10]

In this essay, I specifically examine bk. 4 of Bonaventure's *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard* with a view to investigating how he treats the "institution" of the seven sacraments. I will demonstrate that, according to Bonaventure's position, Christ did not, in any strict or narrow sense, institute all seven sacraments of the New Law. It is rather, as Bonaventure writes: "they were instituted differently at different times."[11] Holding to this position, Bonaventure is faithful to an earlier and much broader vision of the notion of "institution" of sacraments. He follows Hugh of St Victor's sense of the different "*instituta*" that is, of the "different times" or periods in salvation history.[12]

In the first of two parts, I will examine how Bonaventure opens his treatment of the sacraments in bk. 4 of his *Commentary on the Sentences*. This first part of the essay will present his broad vision of why there are sacraments in the first place.

The second part will address more specifically the institution of each of the seven sacraments in particular. Here it will become clear Bonaventure teaches that three, not seven, sacraments were instituted by Christ. The conclusion to this essay that follows the two parts, will attempt to bring all of this together by exploring Bonaventure's move from the "passion of Christ" as source for the sacraments in the *Commentary on the Sentences*

---

[10] IV *Sent*., d. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad obj. 2 (4, 53).

[11] IV *Sent*., d. 2, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 51).

[12] Cf. Hugh of St Victor, *De Sacramentis* 1.9.2, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Cambridge, Mass.: 1951), 155: "Now it is looked upon as important, that every sacrament indeed has a similitude from first instruction, institution from superadded dispensation, sanctification for the applied benediction of word or sign." He explains "first similitude itself is from creation (. . .) imposed by the Creator." Institution is the superadded addition to the similitude found in creation, according to differing dispensations of salvation history.

to his later developed understanding in the *Breviloquium* that "the incarnate Word is the fountain of every sacramental grace."[13] It will be seen that all the sacraments have a common source, articulated earlier as the "passion of Christ" or later as "the incarnate Word." However, in neither instance does it mean that Christ instituted all seven sacraments.

Part One: When, Why, How Many?

Early in bk. 4 in his *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, before proceeding to the treatment of specific sacraments, Bonaventure asks when the sacraments were instituted. He responds: "Because the time for remedy began at the fall, advanced in the Law, and was consummated in the Gospel, therefore there are three ages which are appropriate for their institution."[14]

In this response, Bonaventure, again, follows the tradition of Hugh of St Victor's *De Sacramentis fidei.* Hugh considers sacraments from the perspective of salvation history, beginning with the fall, when the need for grace first appeared. Hugh writes:

> The time of institution of the sacraments is believed to have begun from the moment of the first parent, on being expelled by merit of disobedience from the joys of paradise into the exile of this mortal life (. . .). God at once prepared a remedy in His sacraments for restoring man.[15]

This gives reason for Bonaventure to argue that the sacraments "were not always the same, but they were instituted differently at different times."[16] This phrase "instituted differently at different times" catches the same spirit of Hugh, who understands the notion of "institute" as referring to the different moments of salvation history. The *instituta* are the different moments in the unfolding "ordering" of salvation in so far as these are directed toward healing from sin and its effects.

Hugh begins with the "institution" of creation, i.e., the natural law, and then he moves through the institutions of the Old Law to the institution of the New Law of grace.[17] Thus, according to Hugh, sacraments are under-

---

[13] *Brev.*, pars 4, c. 4, n. 4 (5, 131), trans. Monti.
[14] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 49).
[15] *De sacramentis*, 1.8.12, (trans., 150).
[16] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 51).
[17] Hugh writes, "For there are three periods of time through which the space of this world runs. The first is the period of the natural law, the second the period of the written

stood from the perspective of the *instituta* or *praecepta* of a given period of salvation history.[18] It is the specific historical moment of salvation history that determines how God heals and saves.[19] These different periods of salvation history are what form the reason, basis or foundation for the sacraments, that is, the different *instituta* or *praecepta* of the law of creation, the law of Moses, and the law of grace, that is, of the Holy Spirit.

Hugh's framework of salvation, just articulated, makes it easier to understand what Bonaventure means when he writes:

> And so the sacraments of the Written Law add to the sacraments of the Natural Law in so far as concerns certainty of signification and difficulty of burden. The sacraments of the Written Law are therefore more and more apparent. However, the sacraments of the Gospel add to the sacraments of the Written Law with respect to their expression and efficacy and lessen the rigor of their burden. Wherefore, the sacraments of the Gospel are more apparent and more efficacious, but nevertheless fewer.[20]

And so, in Bonaventure's vision, Christ does not bear the full burden of "instituting" sacraments on his own, at least by means of his own specific determination or direction. Rather, sacraments develop and are identified according to God's plan within the different specific ages of salvation. Here again Bonaventure sees a sign of divine wisdom and considers it to be "worthy of highest praise in his works, not because they are all the best possible that he makes in themselves, but rather in their order."[21] Sacraments are the visible signposts of God's ordered plan of salvation. This flows from Bonaventure's vision of creation: "This should thus be noted in the argument made, that he created things in the most ordered way. For just as these sacraments are suited to this time, so the other sacraments were suited to that time."[22]

---

law, the third the period of grace. The first is from Adam even unto Moses, the second from Moses even unto Christ, the third from Christ even unto the end of the world." *De sacramentis*, 1.8.11 (trans., 149).

[18] See *De sacramentis*, 1.8.11 (trans., 148–150).

[19] Hugh writes, "For from the time when man, having fallen from the state of first incorruption, began to ail in body through mortality and in soul through iniquity, God at once prepared a remedy in His sacraments for restoring man. These indeed, as reason and cause demanded, He furnished at different times and places for man's cure: some before the law, others under the law, others under grace, diverse, indeed, in species yet having the one effect and producing the one health": *De sacramentis*, 1.8.12 (trans., 150).

[20] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad obj. 2 (4, 54).

[21] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 2, ad obj. 1 (4, 51).

[22] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 2, ad obj. 1 (4, 52).

This notion of sacraments "instituted differently at different times" forms his basic vision of sacraments. This is based on an even more fundamental insight which he had earlier articulated in distinction 1, where he asked why sacraments were instituted in the first place. His answer is simple and straight forward. It was "fitting for God and advantageous for us."[23] The first question pursues not the how, the when, or the where, but simply the "why." Note below his introductory words in his *respondeo* to this question. He gives three reasons for the "why" of the sacraments:

> Indeed it befitted God's mercy and justice and wisdom which mark every way of the Lord. It befitted his mercy because humanity poorly kept his grace on the account of the changeableness of human will. Therefore God instituted the sacraments to which humanity could have recourse to recover God's grace. Thus it was a great act of mercy, chiefly because they not only provide the remission of fault, but also the remission of penalty. Therefore God instituted the sacraments to which humanity could have recourse to recover God's grace. It befitted God's justice as well, because since he is just, he required some humiliation through which man would dispose himself toward grace. Thus by receiving the sacraments he would find grace as if from a kind of covenant. It was also befitting God's wisdom. This is because it is of the highest wisdom to find a remedy in the very things that were the occasion of the fall, such that just as man fell through wood, so through wood would he find a healthful remedy. Thus because man had taken the occasion for the fall from visible things, it befitted divine wisdom to find remedy in the same things.[24]

The above text serves as an opening statement in Bonaventure's treatment of the sacraments. It is God who instituted the sacraments. God instituted sacraments because of his mercy, justice, and wisdom. First of all, sacraments demonstrate God's mercy because sacraments provide a way to which "humanity could have recourse to recover God's grace." Secondly, sacraments manifest God's justice. This is because sacramental grace is signified through created elements, lower on the scale of perfection than the human person. They occasion therefore a disposition of humility that disposes toward grace. Finally, God's wisdom is also manifested precisely because God finds remedy in visible things, which were the very occasion for the fall. Thus, visible things become the instruments of healing grace. The "why" of the sacraments is found in their manifestation of God's mercy, justice, and wisdom. These manifestations "are advantageous for us."

---

[23] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad resp. (4, 12).
[24] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad resp. (4, 12).

It is important to note that at the end of his introductory statement, Bonaventure explicitly repeats the statement of Peter Lombard that "God did not bind his power to the sacraments."[25] God's grace works apart from the sacraments. For this reason, Bonaventure makes it clear: "It was therefore not necessary to institute the sacraments." Sacraments were instituted only "by the necessity of congruity, but not of inevitability."[26] Sacraments need not be, but they are most fitting for both for God, for the manifestation of his mercy, justice, and wisdom, and thus for humanity as a help unto salvation.

In other words, sacraments are necessary only congruously. They are necessary simply because God chose to reveal Himself as merciful, just and wise. Sacraments assist the human who, having fallen through visible things, needs help in disposing himself or herself to healing grace. It is fitting this be done through visible things. Sin has wounded the human heart and soul. Sacraments dispose toward healing. For example, Bonaventure states that sin has blinded the heart into ignorance of spiritual things. "Therefore, visible sacraments were given him for his education."[27] Sacraments both teach and provide external practice or "training" for the interior spiritual development in the order of grace.

"Hence," Bonaventure concludes, "the sacraments are help to grace, and are so not superfluous."[28] Wounded by sin, the human person needs help. Sacraments provide that help. So it simply makes sense that in the design of God's mercy, justice, and wisdom there are sacraments. The power to heal is and remains God's effective power giving informative power through grace. In this context, he explains that the sacraments have "dispositive" power only, that is, to dispose the recipient toward receiving grace. He writes: "To dispose is ours with God's help [the sacraments], but the effect [grace] belongs to God alone."[29]

Bonaventure's first and basic question about sacraments is the "why." He argues for the sacraments because of the congruity of such, both on the part of the nature of God's justice, mercy, and wisdom and on the part of the human in need of redemption, who fell through visible things and needs to be educated and disposed toward a recovery of the grace lost. For

[25] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad resp. (4, 12). Cf. Peter Lombard, IV *Sent.*, d. 1, c. 5: *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, vol. 2 (Grottaferrata: 1981), 235.
[26] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad resp. (4, 12).
[27] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad resp. (4, 12).
[28] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad 2. (4, 12).
[29] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, a. un., q. 1, ad 1. (4, 12).

this reason, that is, for a recovery of grace lost, he argues from the point of view of congruency from the perspective of the fallen human person. He makes the point that "sacraments are both figurative and significative" and the "movement of faith is aroused through the delivery of the sign."[30] Furthermore, as stated in similar words above, "a sacrament does not truly have the character of a cause, nor grace the character of an effect."[31] Both flow from the mercy, justice, and wisdom of God.

However, moving forward from Bonaventure's understanding that the reason for sacraments is congruity and advantage for the human person, he develops the importance of the "figurative and significative" character. He teaches that thereby "the movement of faith is aroused through the delivery of the sign." "And so," he concludes, "essentially speaking, a sacrament is a sign."[32] This is how the mercy, justice and wisdom of God operate in the life of the human person who needs healing and helping unto salvation.

Again, "fittingness" (*congruitas*) always remains the fundamental reason for institution: i.e., the fallen human person needs visible signs to be educated, humbled, and drawn into the unseen reality of God's mercy, justice, and wisdom. For this reason, according to the visible nature of the human person, the visible elements of sacraments have their "capacity for signification from nature." Thus, both the nature of God and the nature of the fallen human person are at work in the foundational reasons for the institution of the sacraments. These reasons are valid for the entire history of salvation, beginning especially with the fall, and even before the fall itself:

> Because the time for remedy began at the fall, advanced in the Law, and was consummated in the Gospel, therefore there are three ages which are appropriate for their institution, but still only more or less appropriate.[33]

---

[30] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, p. 1, a. un., q. 2, ad resp. (4, 14).

[31] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, p. 1, a. un., q. 2, ad 2. (4, 15).

[32] IV *Sent.*, d. 1, p. 1, a. un., q. 2, ad resp. (4, 14).

[33] IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 49). Here Bonaventure follows Hugh of St Victor very closely: "Let us consider what the difference is between the sacraments of the New Testament and those which were to be considered sacraments either under the natural law or under the written law": *De sacramentis*, 1.11.4 (trans., 184). He is also considering Alexander of Hales who identifies four periods of salvation history as appropriate for the institution of sacraments: before the fall as the Institution of Nature, after the fall but before the Mosaic Law as the period of Natural Law, the period of the Mosaic law as the Written Law, and the period after Jesus Christ as the time of the Gospel Law. This allows Bonaventure to hold that matrimony was instituted as an office before the fall by Institution of Nature. However, he mostly emphasizes the three periods found in the above citation.

Although the appropriateness of the different sacraments may vary, according to the three ages, sacraments are nevertheless fitting and congruous for the human person in every age of human history. Therefore, it is easy for Bonaventure to see it fitting that the "seven" sacraments were "instituted differently at different times." God's mercy, justice, and wisdom as well as the need of the sinful human person to be disposed toward grace are realities that have a history which begins with the first manifestation of God revealed at the beginning of human history in creation itself and continues through the Old Law even unto the fullness of grace revealed in the New Law.

Part Two: Institution of Seven Specific Sacraments

Differently at different times? Bonaventure's position is that two of the seven were instituted before Christ, two after Christ, and three by Christ.

Before Christ: Matrimony and Penance

Regarding the sacrament of matrimony,[34] Bonaventure follows Hugh when he states that matrimony was first an institution of the work of creation.[35] At the very beginning, it was an office or duty, a *munus*, but after the fall it also became a remedy, a *remedium*.[36] Matrimony is initially an office for procreation established in creation, but immediately after the fall it also becomes a sacrament that heals from sin. Bonaventure gives this an interesting twist. He writes:

> It must be said that since institution looks to use, and the use of matrimony serves as remedy and as duty, but the use of other sacraments serve only as a remedy. Hence the use of matrimony is suited not only for the infirm but also for the healthy. Therefore its institution was two-fold: one before the fall as a duty, and the second after the fall as a remedy.[37]

---

[34] For further information on Bonaventure's treatment of marriage, see Paula Jean Miller, *Marriage: The Sacrament of Divine-Human Communion* (Quincy, IL: 1996).

[35] Hugh writes, "The author of marriage is God. For He himself decreed that there be marriage, when He made woman as an assistance to man in the propagation of the race": *De sacramentis*, 2.11.2 (trans., 325).

[36] Hugh writes, "The institution of marriage is twofold: one before sin for the office, the other after sin for remedy": *De sacramentis*, 2.11.3 (trans., 325).

[37] IV *Sent*., d. 26, a. 1, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 662).

In this manner Bonaventure brings forward Peter Lombard's position: "While the other sacraments take their origin after the sin, we read that the sacrament of marriage was established before the sin."[38] Then, Bonaventure adds that this same sacrament initially established for the healthy in the state of innocence takes on a new dimension of healing when the healthy become infirm after the fall. Thus, institution of this sacrament is "two-fold." In this text, two different understandings of "institution" emerge.

At the beginning of the following question, qu. 2 in art. 10 f the same twenty-sixth distinction, Bonaventure asks: "By whom was the sacrament of Matrimony instituted?" His answer is direct, but nuanced:

> It must be said that the institution of Matrimony is by God. Nevertheless it should be noted that there are some sacraments that are simply of faith, such as Baptism, Confirmation, and similar ones. Some are not only of faith, but also of natural precept. These are Penance and Matrimony. Yet they are not totally from a precept of natural law. Those of the first kind God instituted by mandate. Those of the second kind he instituted by interior enlightenment. It was in this second way that he instituted Matrimony. Therefore he did not command Adam to take Eve as his wife, but God enlightened him interiorly so that he would understand that she was given to him as a wife and that wives for everyone who followed would be conjoined in that manner by free consent.[39]

He makes it clear that it was God who instituted the sacrament of Matrimony as a natural precept in the very first instance of created history; God did this through the "interior enlightenment" he inspired within Adam. He clarifies this statement: "Rather he spoke through Adam when Adam, inspired by the Holy Spirit, spoke that word in God's name. This is apparent because Matthew 19:5 repeats it as the word of God."[40] Thus, he makes explicit that the institution of Matrimony through "interior enlightenment" is very different from institution "by mandate," as in the above example of Baptism.

In this way, Bonaventure acknowledges that Matrimony has a "two-fold" institution not only in terms of the time of institution (before and after the fall), but there is also a "two-fold" institution in terms of the human element in Adam and of the divine element through the enlightenment

---

[38] Lombard, IV *Sent.*, d. 26, c. 1.
[39] IV *Sent.*, d. 26, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 664).
[40] IV *Sent.*, d. 26, a. 1, q. 2, ad obj. 3 (4, 664).

given him. The human element is clear, but Bonaventure cautions: "it is not purely human."[41] He adds:

> There are two things in marriage: mutual obligation and the indissolubility of that mutual obligation. Although the first is human, the second is of the one who instituted. It is principally by reason of that indissolubility that Matrimony has the character of a sacrament and of a sacred sign. Hence, it takes its origin not from the human person but from God.[42]

So among "the three ages which are appropriate for their institution"[43] Bonaventure places matrimony in the first age. Its roots, however, are grounded in first age of creation before the fall. Sometimes he refers to the first age in two ways: as pertaining to the age of creation itself or as pertaining to the age after the fall before the Law of Moses. In this case, he sees matrimony as pertaining to both notions of the first age, creation and then after the fall before the Law.

The sacrament of penance has a similar story. The institution of the sacrament of penance likewise moves through the ages of salvation. In asking the question about the institution of the sacrament of penance, Bonaventure again responds in a two-fold manner: first in terms of reconciliation to God and second in reconciliation to the Church.

Reconciliation to God is the first and fundamental institution. When speaking in these terms of the foundational institution of the sacrament of reconciliation to God, Bonaventure writes: "then it belongs to the decree of natural law, which dictates that there be contrition and humiliation for sin."[44] He subsequently adds what he considers another, even more sound opinion on the initial institution of the sacrament of penance: "The Lord insinuated and instituted it, when after the sin he called Adam (Gen. 3:9) 'Where are you?' where the Gloss says the Lord wanted him to return to his heart."[45] Like marriage, penance has its roots in a "decree of the natural law" moving the heart to yearn for reconciliation. Built upon this natural desire there is the interior inspiration or enlightenment given to Adam as he hears the Lord call out to him: "Where are you?" This leads Bonaventure to conclude: "And so it is apparent that penance, insofar as it was a sacrament that reconciles with God, was insinuated there, which

---

41 IV *Sent.*, d. 26, a. 1, q. 2, ad obj. 4 (4, 664).
42 IV *Sent.*, d. 26, a. 1, q. 2, ad obj. 4 (4, 664).
43 IV *Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 49).
44 IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 578).
45 IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 579).

was sufficient for that time. Furthermore that insinuation along with the natural dictate sufficed in place of institution."[46]

Reconciliation with the church follows reconciliation with God, he writes: "in this it had its institution in the written law, whether Mosaic or evangelical."[47] In other words, this sacrament is identified as instituted first and foremost by the law of nature and then subsequently again in the new institution of the written law, that is in both the Old Law and the New Law. Reconciliation with the Church finds its institution within the broad spectrum of both the Old and the New:

> There is still another way of speaking of Penance, to the extent that it is a sacrament of the Church. In this respect it had its institution in the written law, whether Mosaic or Evangelical. In the Mosaic Law, because there was still neither perfect unity nor perfect reconciliation, it had an institution that was imperfect. This is namely with respect to a certain generality in determining offerings, which served in place of confession and satisfaction. However, in the New Law, where ecclesiastical unity is perfect and reconciliation is complete, it was instituted for the perfect state.[48]

Penance as a sacrament of reconciliation with the church is initially instituted (not just prefigured) within the penitential practices of the Old Law. When that reconciliation comes to perfection in the New Law, another stage of the institution of the sacrament of penance is achieved. Then reconciliation is complete. Finally, Bonaventure writes that the full development and perfection of this sacrament in the New Law is achieved "with respect to the form, which is the priestly absolution and binding, and with respect to the matter which is a clear and open confession."[49] He explains this further. The fullness is finally achieved in the time of the apostles:

> The first, priestly absolution and binding, the Lord instituted of himself and promulgated, namely the power of the keys, which is recorded in John 20:22–23 after the resurrection. And the second, the clear and open confession, was instituted by the Apostles, or to put it better, was promulgated when the Lord taught the Apostles, and they once instructed by the Lord and having received authority, or still better they promulgated it on his authority. For they handed on to us nothing but what they had received either from the Lord or from the Spirit of the Lord.[50]

---

[46] IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 579).
[47] IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 579).
[48] IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 579).
[49] IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 579).
[50] IV *Sent.*, d. 22, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 579).

Just as marriage, discussed above, was instituted by God through a "two-fold" institution, so in penance is there also a "two-fold" institution, that is, first by "natural dictate" and second by "the written law, whether Mosaic or evangelical." Within the second institution of "written law" there are two phases, the Old Law and the New Law. Again, within the New Law Bonaventure writes there are another two additional phases, that is "with respect to the form, which is the priestly absolution and binding, and with respect to the matter which is a clear and open confession." The first is of the Lord in Jn. 20:22–23, and the second is of the Apostles, from what they received "either from the Lord or from the Spirit of the Lord."

Thus, the sacrament of penance is instituted in various stages. The first stage begins in the garden when the Lord spoke and sought out Adam. This is the foundational institution of the sacrament of penance, reconciliation to God. The sacrament of penance is further developed in the practices of the Mosaic Law and comes to fulfillment in the Law of the Gospel in two final additional dimensions: when before the resurrection the Lord grants the power of the keys and finally after the resurrection when "the Spirit of the Lord" is conferred by the apostles. The institution of penance is much like matrimony. It was well established and practiced before Christ.

After Christ: Confirmation and Extreme Unction

After the first mention of the role of the Spirit of the Lord in the final institution of the sacrament of penance, the move is now to Bonaventure's treatment of the sacrament of confirmation. The treatise on confirmation in his *Commentary on the Sentences* is the shortest of all. There are only three articles. He does not, as in most of the other sacraments, articulate a specific question on the "institution" of the sacrament of Confirmation. However, his understanding on the institution of this sacrament comes to light when he discusses the "form" or the visible sign/word of this sacrament. Bonaventure first argues against the position of others: "some say that Christ instituted that form and handed it on to the Apostles, and the Apostles afterwards left it to others, even though this is not written in the canon of the Scripture."[51]

The Holy Spirit was given after Christ had been glorified and ascended into heaven. At Pentecost, the apostles were confirmed "directly and

[51] IV *Sent*., d. 7, a. 1, q. 1, ad obj. 1 (4, 164).

without the ministry and the sacrament."[52] He then moves forward to explain that it is the Holy Spirit, not Christ, who instituted the sacrament of confirmation. The full text follows:

> However, it can be explained otherwise, and I think better, that Christ neither arranged nor instituted this sacrament. This is because it was fitting that the Apostles be confirmed and given the Spirit as a strengthener after his ascension. Hence John 7:39 says, 'The Holy Spirit was not yet given, since Jesus had not yet been glorified,' not given, I should say, in its fullness or for strengthening. This indeed he did on the day of Pentecost. Hence they were confirmed by the Holy Spirit directly without the ministry and the sacrament. Furthermore they also confirmed others without a word as well. However, after the pillars of the Church, namely the Apostles, had passed on, who had been ordained prelates and confirmed by God, and not through human beings, the Holy Spirit instituted the form of this sacrament, on which he also bestowed the power to sanctify.[53]

Bonaventure argues that at Pentecost the apostles were "confirmed directly by the Holy Spirit"[54] without any elements of the sacrament. In this context, he explicitly states "Christ did not institute this sacrament, because believers were to be confirmed after his ascension."[55] He writes that the sacrament of confirmation developed later for two reasons: it was "instituted under the direction of the Holy Spirit, by Church leaders themselves; and because Christ had not instituted it or given it its power."[56]

Anointing or unction of the dying is the second sacrament instituted after the ascension of Christ. In his opening consideration on the question about the institution of Extreme Unction, Bonaventure explicitly rejects the notion held by some "that all the sacraments were instituted by Christ because he was the legislator."[57] He gets more explicit in his rejection that all sacraments were instituted by Christ. He asks "although nothing is expressly mentioned about confirmation and extreme unction, still it is to be believed that he (Jesus Christ) instituted them?"[58] Bonaventure further asks: "how probable is it that all the Evangelists pass by in silence such noble sacraments, if Christ had instituted them?"[59] Then, he

---

[52] IV *Sent.*, d. 7, a. 1, q. 1, ad obj. 1 (4, 164).
[53] IV *Sent.*, d. 7, a. 1, q. 1, ad obj. 1 (4, 164).
[54] IV *Sent.*, d. 7, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 166).
[55] IV *Sent.*, d. 7, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 166).
[56] IV *Sent.*, d. 7, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 166).
[57] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).
[58] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).
[59] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).

moves forward to agree with his *magister*, Peter Lombard "that the Holy Spirit instituted this sacrament through the Apostles, as was said above of confirmation."[60] Bonaventure concludes the whole question on the institution of Extreme Unction in the following manner: "that the Holy Spirit instituted this sacrament through the Apostles is to be conceded."[61] How can this happen?

> That this could happen is clear, since the Spirit is the principal teacher just as Christ is; and it is evident through an example, because the Apostles, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, changed for a time the form of Baptism that was instituted and confirmed by Christ. How much more were they able to institute what Christ had insinuated?[62]

He notes that the two sacraments, confirmation and extreme unction, as instituted by the Holy Spirit after the ascension of Jesus, add to "the diversity of sacraments."[63] There are those sacraments "common to the Old and New Law" such as Matrimony and Penance. There are also these two sacraments common to the New Law:

> And these are the ones that signify grace in such a condition as properly befits the New Law; these are two: confirmation and unction, in which the grace of the Holy Spirit is signified (. . .). And because they signify the grace of the Holy Spirit in some abundance, and the Holy Spirit was not given in abundance until Jesus was glorified as is said in John 7:39, so these sacraments were insinuated by Christ, but afterwards they were instituted by the Holy Spirit.[64]

In this context he makes the bold statement: "Hence, we attribute the institution of the sacraments to God, either through the Son or through the Holy Spirit."[65] Confirmation and unction are entirely new. They are after Christ. They are not prefigured in the Old Law. They have no direct connection to the law of nature or to the Law of Moses, as do Matrimony and Penance. They are totally the abundant work of the Spirit.

---

[60] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591). Cf., Lombard, IV *Sent.*, d. 23, c. 3.
[61] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).
[62] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).
[63] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).
[64] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591): *Ideo haec duo sacramenta a Christo fuerunt insinuata, sed post a Spiritu Sancto fuerunt instituta.* In consideration of the sacraments instituted by the Holy Spirit after the Resurrection, Bonaventure employs a new term, *insinuata*, to maintain a Christological connection. The work of the Spirit flows from Christ, but he clearly wishes to distinguish and identify these two sacraments as principally the work of the Spirit in the post-Pentecost life of the Church.
[65] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad obj. 2–3 (4, 92).

In the *responsio* to this question on the institution of extreme unction Bonaventure develops a beautiful *excursus* on the "fittingness" of the "diversity" in the institution of seven sacraments. Each sacrament has its own story and its own institution in different periods of salvation history. The text of Bonaventure's *excursus* is as follows. He articulates an appropriate summary as he notes the "diversity" of the four sacraments thus far considered:

> Some sacraments are common to the Old and New Law, some are most proper to the New Law, and some stand midway between. The common ones are those which are in some manner by dictate of nature, which because it always remains the same, those sacraments ran together from the beginning, such as Matrimony and Penance, the latter to the extent that it reconciles to God. These two the Lord Jesus did not purge, but brought to consummation and confirmation in the New Law.
>
> Some are most proper to the New Law, and these are those that signify grace in such a condition as properly befits the New Law. These are two: Confirmation and Unction, in which the grace of the Holy Spirit is signified, according to which person is anointed as a fighter, so that he may dare to die for Christ and as a king so that he might be able to enter the kingdom of heaven as if into his own. This is proper to the New Law, hence in the Old these two sacraments have no set figure. This is because they signify the grace of the Holy Spirit in abundance, the Holy Spirit was not given in abundance until Jesus was glorified as is said in John 7:39, so these two sacraments were insinuated by Christ, but afterward they were instituted by the Holy Spirit.[66]

Midway Sacraments: Baptism, Eucharist and Orders

Now, consideration moves to the sacraments Bonaventure teaches are directly instituted by Christ Himself. In his discussion about the "diversity" of the sacraments, there are sacraments that are either before Christ and thus earlier (Matrimony and Penance) or after Christ and thus later (Confirmation and Unction). This third category of sacraments stands in the middle. They are the "midway" sacraments.[67] The midway or middle sacraments are the sacraments instituted by Christ:

---

[66] IV *Sent.*, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591).

[67] Note the emergence of a Trinitarian framework. Christ holds the middle place and thus the sacraments instituted by Christ are the "middle" sacraments. There are those instituted by God as Creator and Father, and those instituted by the Holy Spirit. Sacraments are the work of the Trinity.

> Some are midway sacraments, which in the Old Law did not exist in truth, but existed in figure and in signification, such as Baptism, the Eucharist and Order. Thus, because Christ fulfilled the Law and emptied the figures, these three sacraments he instituted himself.[68]

This is the only text in his *Commentary on the Sentences* where, as far as I could find, Bonaventure explicitly states Christ instituted the sacrament of Order, and it should be noted this is done in connection with Baptism and Eucharist. Unlike Baptism and Eucharist, however, in no other place in bk. 4 of his *Commentary on the Sentences* does Bonaventure pursue further the specific question about the institution of the sacrament of Order.

In considering the institution of Baptism, Bonaventure writes that in the Gospels Christ insinuated this sacrament with his words to Nicodemus (Jn. 3:5); he instituted this sacrament when he began to baptize with his disciples (Jn. 3:22), and he confirmed this after his resurrection in Matthew nineteen when he sent his disciples forth to baptize.[69] Note that Bonaventure distinguishes between insinuate, institute, and confirm. Institution of baptism, in this instance, is clearly based on the action of Jesus.

In regard to the institution of the Eucharist,[70] Bonaventure basically presumes that Christ instituted this sacrament because it contains the true body and blood of Christ. Although his treatment on the Eucharist is the longest of his considerations on sacraments, his question on the institution of this sacrament is very brief. He centers rather on the question of "when" Christ instituted this sacrament. His answer to this question goes beyond a biblical text, and moves into the meaning of the Eucharist itself to discern when Christ instituted this sacrament:

> It must be said that this sacrament, only in so far as it is visible, does contain the true body of Christ. Thus in this sacrament is truly food and the principal sign of love. Food, that is, insofar as it is refreshing and therefore instituted at the time of refreshment, and good insofar as it is paschal and

---

[68] IV *Sent*., d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 591): *Quaedam sunt sacramenta media, quae in veteri legi non fuerunt in veritate, fuerunt in figura et significatione, sicut baptismus, eucharistia, et ordo. Et quia Christus Legem implevit et figuras evacuavit, haec tria Sacramenta per se ipsum instituit.*

[69] Cf., IV *Sent*., d. 3, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad obj. 3 & 4 (4, 77–78).

[70] For further information on the Eucharist in the Middle Ages, see Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c.1080–c.1220*, (New York: 1984); Idem, *The Theology of the Eucharist in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century: Reception According to the Franciscans* (San Diego: 1986); and Idem, *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages* (Leiden: 2012).

> therefore in the paschal Supper. This sacrament was also truly a sign of love. Therefore, since upon departing it is appropriate for one to show signs of love and remembrance so that he remain more etched in memory, it was appropriate that this sacrament was instituted at the Last Supper.[71]

Turning to the sacrament of Order, Bonaventure opens the discussion by taking a radically different approach. He asks whether there is order in the church.[72] His point of departure for first approaching the sacrament of Order is his consideration of the nature of the church. Order is necessary for the church. He responds to the question in the following way:

> It must be said that order is necessary in the Church for two reasons, namely for the sake of beauty and for the sake of rectitude. For since there is a great multitude in the Church, unless there were order, confusion would clearly appear, and this is the abomination of the multitude. Hence, any wise person, who just because he is wise, is a lover of beauty, does not produce a multitude of things without order. Precisely in this does the wisdom of God so especially appear, and is manifest among all his works in the constitution of the Church. Order is also necessary for the sake of rectitude. For, the multitude is in a condition in which it can lose its way and goes astray if it does not have a leader or ruler (...). It has need of a head and government. Furthermore, since one could not suffice for all things and for everybody, hence it was necessary to more or less distribute ecclesiastical offices and powers, so that the Church be ruled and directed without error.[73]

Is the ecclesial ordering of the church a sacrament? This is his central question. He includes Order (along with Baptism and Eucharist) as a "midway" sacrament of the New Law. He holds that the sacrament of Order is instituted by Christ because Christ fulfilled what was prefigured in the Old Law. Order, like the Eucharist, is a fulfillment of what was prefigured in the Old Law:

> Hence, just as the sacrament of the Eucharist is proper to the New Law, even though there was in the Old Law a sacrifice that was a sign of this, so also is the spiritual power proper to the New Law, following that to which the sacrament of Order is directed. So Order is proper to the New Law, although a figurative sign of an inferior Order preceded Order and priesthood (...). Therefore, it is to be conceded that just as Baptism and the Eucharist are sacraments proper to the New Law, even though they were prefigured in what preceded them, so is it with sacred ordination.[74]

---

71 IV *Sent.*, d. 8, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2 ad resp. (4, 186).
72 Cf., IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 1 (4, 614–615).
73 IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 614–615).
74 IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 3, ad resp. (4, 618).

He further argues that Order is a sacrament principally because of the other sacraments:

> However, the principal reason why this power ought to be conferred in the manner of a sacrament is on account of the dignity of the sacraments which are dispensed in the Church and in which God is worshipped. If these sacraments are not to be brought into contempt, they should not have been given to all for their dispensing, but to special persons. Thus, so long as something is committed to these special persons that is not given to others, there is given to them a power by which they are placed in a special order within the Church of God. Further, because these special persons ought to be discernible to others through some signs, and such a sign is of a sacred thing, hence this power ought to be ordered by way of a sacrament. This is most fitting. For since it be for the orderly administration of the sacraments, the ministers ought to have been ordered for this through the reception of some sacrament, in which the power is given through which the ministers of God are ordained for ministry and also ordered among themselves; hence it rightly is called Order.[75]

In both instances Bonaventure draws his understanding of the sacrament of Order from its relationship to order in the church, to the orderly administration of the sacraments. He affirms that "it is principally ordered to the ministry of the Sacrament of the altar, which is one."[76] It is from his vision of the nature of the church and the dignity of the sacraments that he argues it is "most fitting" that the sacred ordering be identified by a sacred sign. It is important in discussing Bonaventure's understanding of the sacrament of Order to remember that he is including all the orders:

> It must be said that the sacrament of Order is one, but it has many parts (…). All of these in large part befit order. This is because order means an ordered authority, in which through the ordination of many to one end becomes perfect. By reason of authority all of these parts share in the sacrament of Order, even if not all do so by reason of its perfection (…). Thus all the grades of Order make one perfect sacrament, and still each grade is called Order.[77]

In all of these grades of Order Bonaventure writes that "character is imprinted in all the Orders (…). For since character is a distinctive and perpetual seal and configures one to Christ, and this is found in all the

---

[75] IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q 2, ad resp. (4, 619).

[76] IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 4, ad obj. 3 (4, 619).

[77] IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 4, ad resp. (4, 619). These seven orders are porter, lector, exorcist, acolyte, and the two orders that minister directly to the priest (sub-deacon and deacon). Cf., IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 2, a. 1, q. 3, ad resp. (4, 625–626).

Orders, there should be no doubt that character is imprinted in all the Orders."[78] This confirms his vision that the sacrament of Order is one sacrament with many parts. It is important to note this, because conferral of character is another way he links the sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist, and Order:

> Since Christ had a threefold office, namely, ministry in action, fighting in his suffering, redeeming in his dying. Thus the sacrament according to which a person is configured to Christ is threefold and in these same three offices. Hence there are only three sacraments in which character is impressed. Baptism configures one to the dying and redeeming Christ by which a person is buried with him in death. Confirmation configures him to the suffering and fighting Christ, hence a sign of the cross is imprinted on the forehead. Order configures one to the ministering and laboring Christ. Thus, because all of these are configured to Christ more or less, character is imprinted in all of them.[79]

Unlike Baptism in which Bonaventure specifically identifies when, where, and how Christ instituted this fundamental sacrament, and unlike the Eucharist in which he specifies the "when" Christ instituted this highest of the sacraments, he does not deem it necessary to identify when, where, or how Christ instituted the sacrament of Order. He does not pursue that question. His question focuses on whether or not Order is a sacrament at all. He makes his case that it is a sacrament, based on the need for order in the church, for the worthy administration of the sacraments, and also because of a link to Baptism and Eucharist.

All three of these sacraments, although prefigured in the Old Law, did not, like Matrimony and Penance, actually exist in the Old Law. However, it is precisely because of their prefiguration that they begin to exist in the New Law. It is this prefigured connection to the Old Law, as fulfilled in Christ, that gives Bonaventure reason to connect Order with the institution of the other two prefigured sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. More dramatically, Bonaventure argues for the connection of these three sacraments by reason of the conferral of character common to all three. "There are three sacraments in which character is impressed." These three, in view of the character impressed, cannot be separated. The character impressed with the sacrament of Order is based on the character impressed in Baptism and Confirmation. Thus, without a basis in any specific action or word of Christ, Bonaventure, when speaking of the sacra-

---

[78] IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad resp. (4, 622).
[79] IV *Sent.*, d. 24, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, ad obj. 2 (4, 622).

ments of the New Law as fulfilling the three prefigured ones of the Old Law, identifies Order, along with Baptism and Eucharist, as instituted by Christ. It is simply fitting!

Conclusion

In the *Prologue* to bk. 4 of *The Commentary on the Sentences*, Bonaventure emphasizes that the passion of Christ is the source of the sacraments: "The sacraments are memorial signs of the passion that was accomplished in the past."[80] Again, he writes: "It is from his death that the sacraments derive their life-giving efficacy."[81] Later in the *Breviloquium* he shifts his emphasis and explains that "the incarnate Word" is "the fountain of every sacramental grace."[82] He explains this further:

> Our restoring Principle is Christ crucified, namely, the Incarnate Word. He is, by the very fact of being the Word, coequal and consubstantial with the Father. He is therefore the Word of supreme power, truth, and goodness, and as such possesses supreme authority (. . .).[83] Furthermore, the restoring principle is not simply the Word as such, but the Word as incarnate. It is by virtue of his becoming incarnate that he offers himself to all to impart knowledge of truth and gives himself to all those who come to him worthily to bestow the grace of healing.[84]

Initially, in bk. 4 of his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Bonaventure wrote that the "life-giving efficacy" of the sacraments has its source in the passion. Later, in the *Breviloquium*, he develops the sacramental or "restoring principle." Sacraments operate according to the nature or principle of the incarnate Word "when the elements present themselves to the eyes and the words to the ears."[85] In this context, he makes the general statement: "Therefore, being full of grace and truth, the Word Incarnate instituted the sacraments in both material elements and words, so that they might signify more clearly and sanctify more effectively."[86] In this context, sacraments in their visibility and audibility are extensions of the incarnation of

---

[80] IV *Sent.*, Prooem. (4, 2) The translation of the prologue to bk. 4 is by Timothy Johnson, *Bonaventure: Mystic of God's Word* (New York: 1999), 70.
[81] IV *Sent.*, Prooem. (4, 2); trans., 72.
[82] *Brev.*, pars 6, c. 4, n. 4 (5, 131); trans., 223.
[83] *Brev.*, pars 6, c. 4, n. 2 (5, 130); trans., 222.
[84] *Brev.*, pars 6, c.4, n. 3 (5, 130); trans., 222.
[85] *Brev.*, pars 6, c.4, n. 3 (5, 130); trans., 222.
[86] *Brev.*, pars 6, c.4, n. 3 (5, 130); trans., 222.

the Word. To explain this more fully, Bonaventure adds the sacraments are incarnational in so far as they "present themselves to the eyes and words to the ears" and "they convey clearly the inner meaning of the outward sign."[87]

The source of the sacraments is and remains Christ crucified, the incarnate Word on the cross. In the very broadest sense, that is, in speaking of the source and again of the operating principle of the sacraments, the Incarnate Word, it can be said Christ "instituted" seven sacraments. And this Bonaventure explicitly states in the *Breviloquium*: "Christ instituted the seven sacraments in virtue of his role as mediator of a new covenant." As applied to all seven sacraments, the notion of "institution" has a broad meaning. All seven flow forth from the role of Christ as mediator, the *medium* or the incarnate Word, holding the middle place, also as the uncreated Word and the inspired Word.

Bonaventure's thinking in the *Breviloquium* does not undo his earlier position, articulated in bk. 4 of the *Commentary on the Sentences*. He again explicitly states that "it was fitting that the sacraments be instituted in different ways."[88] He then says that Christ did not institute penance and matrimony "as something new." These were established by the Uncreated Word "in a certain way through the dictates of nature." Two others, confirmation and penance, are established by the inspired Word, after the Holy Spirit was sent and so these two were not instituted directly by Christ. He only "alluded" to them.[89]

Then he again identifies the three sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist and Orders as the intermediate sacraments, standing in the middle (*in medio tempore*). These were instituted by Christ *directe, distincte* and *proprie*. Christ fulfilled their initial prefiguration, found in the Old Law, and brought them to reality *in veritate*. He again emphasizes that these are the only three sacraments that were fully (*plene*) instituted by Christ.[90] This is similar to what he held in his *Commentary on the Sentences*. In that text, he stated that the only these three intermediate sacraments were instituted by Christ in and of himself, that is, *per se ipsum.*[91]

In both the *Commentary on the Sentences* and in the *Breviloquium*, these three sacraments are the only ones Bonaventure identifies as directly, distinctly, properly and fully instituted by Christ. He makes clear that his

---

87 *Brev*., pars 6, c. 4, n. 3 (5, 130); trans., 223.
88 *Brev*., pars 6, c. 4, n. 4 (5, 131); trans., 223.
89 *Brev*., pars 6, c. 4, n. 4 (5, 131); trans., 223.
90 Cf. *Brev*., pars 6, c. 4, n. 4 (5, 131); trans., 224.
91 See n. 60 above.

use of "institution" relative to these three sacraments has a unique meaning and cannot be applied to the other four sacraments in the same way. Rather, only in a very broad and diverse general way and "in virtue of his role as mediator of a new covenant and principal author of a law through which he called humankind to promised eternal goods,"[92] can it be said Christ "instituted" the other four sacraments. This broad and general use of "institution" by Christ does not apply to the specific and diverse ways in which the other four sacraments are instituted within the order of salvation history, from the beginning of creation to the abundance of the work of the Spirit in the church:

> Now Christ instituted these sacraments in different ways. Some (already existing) he confirmed, approved and brought to perfection, namely, Matrimony and Penance. Others he alluded to and merely introduced, namely, Confirmation and Extreme Unction, but others he inaugurated, brought to perfection, and received, namely Baptism, the Eucharist and Orders. These last three he instituted fully and was the first to receive.[93]

These different times of institution of sacraments, before and after Christ's sojourn on earth, are fitting "even though the Incarnate Word is the fountain of every sacramental grace."[94] Finally, only three of them, he repeats, "he instituted fully and was the first to receive." He explains further:

> Therefore, it was fitting that these three sacraments be instituted distinctly and entirely by Christ himself and be prefigured frequently in the old law, since they are the essential sacraments of the New Testament, and proper to its lawgiver himself, the Incarnate Word.[95]

Not all sacraments are instituted equally. Not all sacraments are equal. Only three of them are of the substance (*tanquam Sacramenta substantialia*) of the New Law and are proper to the specific, direct, and distinct institution of the lawgiver himself. However, these three sacraments, as the "midway" sacraments, are to be understood in the context of the history of salvation. Unlike the two sacraments established in the Old Law and the two sacraments established by the "Spirit of the Lord" in the apostolic church, only these three sacraments have a unique relationship to the action of Christ as the one who fulfills the Old Law. Therefore, "institution" of sacraments has diverse meanings for different sacraments according to their different roles in the history of salvation.

---

[92] *Brev.*, pars 6, c. 4, n. 1 (5, 129); trans., 221.
[93] *Brev.*, pars 6, c. 4, n. 1 (5, 130); trans., 221.
[94] *Brev.*, pars 6, c. 4, n. 4 (5, 131); trans., 223.
[95] *Brev.*, pars 6, c. 4, n. 4. (5, 131); trans., 224.

To miss or overlook different nuances and the differences in significance of the use of the term "institution by Christ" is also to miss the Trinitarian context of Bonaventure's sacramental theology. God the Father, through the *Verbum Increatum*, the primary source of life and grace at work in creation, and through natural dictates, establishes the first two sacraments. God the Holy Spirit, *the Verbum Inspiratum*, institutes the last two sacraments in the life of the post-Pentecost Church. Between these two periods of salvation history, standing in the middle, the *Verbum Incarnatum*, revealed in the life and ministry of Jesus, institutes the three essential sacraments of the New Law.

A univocal notion of "institution by Christ" not only misses Bonaventure's Trinitarian vision of salvation history, but also lessens the theological richness of each of the sacraments. To hold simply that marriage and penance were instituted by Christ dismisses the natural created realities and the significance of the Old Law found in the heart of these two sacraments. To miss Baptism, Eucharist, and Orders as fulfilling their prefiguration from the Old Law cheapens the significance of the "new covenant" as fulfilled in Christ. In regard to confirmation and unction, to claim simply that Christ instituted these two sacraments weakens the role of the Spirit in the church, who is "the principal teacher just as Christ is." Therefore, to understand the sacraments, one cannot simply look to the life and action of Christ in the Gospels for full appreciation of the nature or significance of the four sacraments fully instituted, *in veritate*, either before Him or after Him.

This has many implications for understanding Bonaventure's sacramental theology. His diverse understanding of the institution of diverse sacraments within the diverse periods of the salvific plan of salvation history also determines the direction of how he understands the visible signifying elements of the sacrament and the healing grace conferred, as well as the matter of their administration. Without understanding marriage as first instituted in the state of innocence, its fundamental goodness to the human experience is overlooked. Without the basics of penance as a sacrament that "reconciles with God," first experienced when the Lord sought out Adam ("Where are you?"), penance becomes an ecclesiastical exercise. The two sacraments of confirmation and unction, "instituted under the direction of the Holy Spirit by Church leaders themselves,"[96]

[96] IV *Sent.*, d. 7, a. 1, q. 2, ad resp. (4, 166).

signify the fortifying and healing abundant grace of the Spirit alive in the Church.

In 1547, the Council of Trent added something new to magisterial teaching on the seven sacraments taught by the two previous councils of Lyon and Florence: "If anyone says that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ (. . .) *anathema sit*."[97] That all seven sacraments were "instituted by Christ" is mentioned neither in councils of Lyon nor in Florence, nor is such a statement explicitly found in the *Sentences of Peter Lombard* and therefore not in Bonaventure's *Commentary on the Sentences*. In the context of his theology of the *Verbum Incarnatum*, Bonaventure makes this statement once in the *Breviloquium*, but even there, as mentioned above, he immediately qualifies the statement by explaining this does not nullify the diverse times and diverse manner of the institution of sacraments. The council was undoubtedly attempting to protect the traditional number of seven sacraments. However, by identifying all seven sacraments as "instituted by Christ," at least on a popular and catechetical level, it appears to this author that an historicist, biblicist, and literal interpretation of what "instituted by Christ" actually meant has followed, and negatively influences debates in sacramental theology even today. In a narrow approach to the "institution" of sacraments, the full mystery of the incarnate Word, as also both uncreated Word and inspired Word, revealed and signified throughout the diverse stages of the history of salvation, is missed. This impoverishes sacramental theology. It is not consistent with the earlier and much richer theological tradition represented so beautifully by the Seraphic Doctor.

---

[97] Can. 1. *Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novae Legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostra instituta, aut esse plura vel pauciora, quam septem, videlicet baptismum, confirmationem, Eucharistiam, paenitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem et matrimonium, aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum: anathema sit* (DS 1601): Denzinger, *Enchiridion* 382.

SPIRITUALITY AND PRACTICE

THEOLOGY, SPIRITUALITY AND CHRIST THE CENTER BONAVENTURE'S SYNTHESIS

Ilia Delio

Introduction

In a recent discussion on spirituality among colleagues at the University of Durham, someone suggested that spirituality is the future of theology. While a wave of shock arose in the group, some agreed that theology needs to be resuscitated from the entrenched dogmatic formulas it finds itself in, if it is to be viable for the future. Although the plea for spirituality as the future of theology may seem novel in our post-enlightenment age, such an idea would have been wholeheartedly embraced by St Bonaventure, who described the purpose of theology as to make us good (*ut boni fiamus*) through the gift of wisdom.[1] As a student of Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure inherited the wealth of patristic and medieval theology and learned the art of scholasticism; as a disciple of Francis of Assisi, he developed an understanding of theology that transcended scholastic modes of thought and centered on mystical union with God.

Two recent studies have shed tremendous light on the relationship between theology and holiness in Bonaventure's thought. In 1999, Charles Carpenter published a work entitled *Theology as the Road to Holiness in St. Bonaventure*, in which he shows that, for Bonaventure, theology is undertaken for the purpose of becoming holy. Carpenter described the study of theology as a spiritual life, indicating that the study of theology can bring about spiritual transformation when it is integrated into the spiritual life. More recently, Gregory LaNave published *Through Holiness to Wisdom: The Nature of Theology According to Bonaventure*, in which he demonstrates the relationship between theology and holiness in Bonaventure through the lens of Francis of Assisi. LaNave's study centers on the question "What is the place of holiness in the task of theology,"—a question that reflects the lament of Hans Urs von Balthasar, who saw a split between

[1] Bonaventure, *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum* (*I–IV Sent.*) prooem., q. 3, resp., in *Opera omnia*, 10 vols. (Quaracchi: 1882–1902), 1, 13.

theology and holiness, much to the detriment of theology.[2] According to LaNave, "theologians involved in the renewal of patristic studies (in the twentieth century) read the Fathers of the Church in part because they wanted to recover their integration of theology and spirituality."[3] LaNave finds a parallel between Balthasar's method of doing theology through the lives of the saints and Bonaventure's theological achievement through the life of Francis of Assisi. For Bonaventure, he states, "Francis's life is not hagiography; it is theology."[4]

The present study is indebted to the works of Carpenter and LaNave and builds upon the common idea that theology is integrally related to holiness. In this study, the concept of holiness is widened into the broader context of spirituality, since holiness is based upon the spiritual life which governs Bonaventure's writings. Theology and spirituality are the two feet by which one journeys to God. On a more formal note, this essay is constructed according to Bonaventure's own insight which he articulated at the end of his career, as he sought to efface the influence of Latin Averroism: "Our intent is to show that in Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and understanding."[5] My thesis is that Bonaventure achieves a synthesis of theology and spirituality through Christ the center, in particular, the crucified Christ, whom he views as the integrating theological center. By subalternating philosophy to theology, Bonaventure constructs a theological metaphysics of Christ the center in which the principle of being is the principle of knowing. True knowledge, in Bonaventure's view, is contemplating the divine Word through whom all things are created and the incarnate Word through whom all things are restored. If theology is knowledge of God, then such knowledge means knowing where we come from, our purpose for existing, and our goal in life. Only one who is in relationship to God can know the source and goal of life through Christ the center.

To examine this thesis, I will look first at the primacy of theology for Bonaventure and the relation of theology to philosophy, since he ultimately constructs an integration of these in Christ the center. Then I will

---

[2] Gregory LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom: The Nature of Theology according to St. Bonaventure* (Rome: 2005), 7.

[3] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 7. LaNave cites an article by Roch Kereszty, "Theology and Spirituality: The Task of a Synthesis," *Communio* 10 (1983): 314, who notes that the promise of these endeavors largely failed to materialize.

[4] The three principal works that are modeled on Francis are Bonaventure's *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, *Legenda maior*, and *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*; LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 13.

[5] Bonaventure, *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* (*Hex.*) 1.11 (5, 331).

briefly examine his theological method, particularly that of *perscrutatio*, which uniquely combines scholastic and symbolic modes of thought. The classic text that integrates theology and spirituality is his *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*; thus, I will discuss the stages of this journey to show the relationship between spiritual development and theological insight. The height of this journey is union with the crucified Christ, and I will examine Christ crucified as the *totum integrale* or the integrating whole of theology for Bonaventure. The import of Christ crucified as the center of theology plays out in the life of Francis of Assisi, and I will examine the life of Francis, particularly the stigmatized Francis, as the model theologian for Bonaventure. The final section examines Bonaventure's metaphysics of Christ the center as the theological center that integrates spirituality in the search for truth. In an age that longs for truth, Bonaventure offers us a way to know the God of overflowing love through the logic of the crucified Christ. It is a way that belies the logic of our own age, for it centers on the *Christian* God who reveals himself to those who enter the mystery of divine love.

Theology and Philosophy

In his *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure* J.G. Bougerol said of Bonaventure, "knowledge is only a stage in the journey of our return to God. This basic belief explains why Bonaventurian theology is so spiritual and Bonaventure's spirituality is so theological."[6] Bougerol's insight captures what typified the patristic and medieval periods in general, namely, the lived unity between theology and spirituality, or "science" and "sanctity." Harvey Egan's description of the patristic fathers is pertinent to Bonaventure as well: "They wrote from what they had seen with the eyes of their Spirit and loved from the depth of their heart."[7] To talk about spirituality for Bonaventure is to talk about theology, for he "saw and experienced the content of his theology; and this experience was considered to belong not to the intellect alone but to the 'eyes of the Spirit' which placed the whole person—intellect, emotion and even sense—in contact with divine existence."[8] The unified relationship between spirituality and

[6] J.G. Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson: 1964), 153.
[7] William M. Thompson, *Fire and Light: The Saints and Theology* (New York: 1987), 43.
[8] Thompson, *Fire and Light*, 54.

theology held by Bonaventure relates to the fact that he had such an integrating mind that, as Etienne Gilson noted, "you can either see the general economy of his doctrine in its totality, or see none of it." He appeared as if bent with all his powers towards the creation of a new synthesis wherein he should find a place for all the philosophical and religious values of which he had a living experience.[9]

Bonaventure's search for a unified theological synthesis is rooted in the understanding of theology itself, the "queen of sciences." His synthesis emerges out of the relationship between theology and philosophy which is one of the most vexing questions in Bonaventurian studies.[10] In his *Sentence* Commentary, Bonaventure gives clear answers to the problem of relations between theology and philosophy, leaving to philosophy no area of independence over which theology does not exercise jurisdiction.[11] He maintained that theology is not a rationalistic deductive science, as philosophy was held to be. Although philosophy is concerned with ultimate reality in a way universally accessible to human reason, the experience of Christ and Christian faith provide clues to ultimate reality that may differ from those of philosophy. In light of the Christ mystery and its metaphysical implications, Bonaventure indicated, all purely philosophical metaphysics must stand open to correction and possible completion in the light of the metaphysical implications of Christ.[12] Philosophy, therefore, is part of the spiritual-intellectual journey of humanity, but itself is incapable of providing an adequate road-map for the journey. Rather, true philosophy is integral to the *mystery* of God. As Carpenter writes, "it would seem for Bonaventure that theology is not only is at home in the realm of mystery, but without mystery as its object theology has no utility above

---

[9] Etienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*, trans. Illtyd Trethowan (New York: 1938), 480.

[10] For a discussion on the problem of philosophy in Bonaventure see P. Robert, "Le problème de la philosophie bonaventurienne" *Laval théologique et philosophique* 6 (1950): 145–163, 7 (1951): 9–58; Pietro Maranesi, "Per un contributo alla 'questione bonaventuriana'," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 58 (1995): 287–314.

[11] Robert (*Le problème*, 9) describes philosophy as a heteronomous discipline in Bonaventure's thought: "Sa philosophie ne serait donc pas une *discipline autonomie*, s'organisant selon des lois et des méthodes qui lui sont propres, mais une discipline hétéronome, intégrée a un organisme de notions et d'influences surnaturelles dont elle adopterait pour autant les principes et les méthodes pour atteindre sa propre fin."

[12] Zachary Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure," *Journal of Religion* 58 (1978): 93.

philosophy.[13] For Bonaventure, all theology is mystical theology because there is a hidden depth to the mystery we name "God"; thus, mysticism is taken to be normative for his theology.[14] What is aimed at in philosophy is known in faith to be Christ as center of the Trinity and exemplary cause of creation in whom the *mystery of God* is revealed.

The priority of theology over philosophy for Bonaventure reflects the fact that the Seraphic Doctor did not view theology strictly as a science. Rather, he defined theology as "the things of faith as they pass over into the understanding" (*credibile, prout tamen transit in rationem intelligibilis*).[15] Theology is determined by the nature of the intellect that knows it, the "extended intellect," in which knowledge and love mutually influence each other.[16] Carpenter has shown that, for Bonaventure, theology is a spiritual life. The object of theology is God and all that originates in God. Carpenter writes: "Nothing therefore is foreign to theology and at the same time mystery permeates all its subject matter, since theology establishes a connection or a 'ladder' between heavenly and earthly realities."[17] Thus, reason never works in isolation but is subordinated to the truths of scripture and needs grace to understand such truths.[18] Although Bonaventure said that theology is rational and demonstrative insofar as theology is reasonable, reason alone cannot justify theology, because the proper object of theology is the truth revealed in scripture. "In Bonaventure's view, everything that belongs to theology concerns the things of faith as they are brought to understanding."[19] Thus, reason must be subalternated to the truths contained in scripture, otherwise the intellect "would refuse

---

[13] Charles Carpenter, *Theology as the Road to Holiness in St. Bonaventure* (New York: 1999), 22.

[14] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 18.

[15] George Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence: The Nature of Theology according to St. Bonaventure* (New York: 1954), 247.

[16] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 24; Carpenter, *Theology as the Road*, 73. Carpenter points out that Bonaventure's most important teacher, Alexander of Hales "does not allow reason *alone* any rights of citizenship within theology, but prefers to see theology perfecting the soul in the affective order to move it toward the good."

[17] Carpenter, *Theology as the Road*, 22.

[18] LaNave (*Through Holiness*, 46) states that "two elements are necessary for sublaternation: first, the subalternated science has to accept its principles from another science; second, the subject of the subalternating science has to be 'higher' than that of the subalternated, meaning simpler, more universal, and at a greater remove from matter." For a detailed discussion of the subalternation of theology to Scripture in Bonaventure, see 46–49; Carpenter, *Theology as the Road*, 107.

[19] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 38.

to honor the highest truth as it should, because it would prefer its own judgment to the command of the eternal light—which necessarily implies the swelling of pride and arrogance."[20] Theology as a science, therefore, is knowledge of God based on scripture. God is the subject of theology because he is the one to whom all things may be reduced as to their origin. Since God is made known in Christ, everything known in theology can be found in Christ. The whole Christ is that to which theology must appeal as the principle drawn from scripture for the construction of a science. Theology's principles of reason therefore are not drawn from purely natural reason, but from a reason that is transformed by grace. Although Bonaventure says that the end of theology is both the grace of contemplation and to become good, he favors the latter, for theology should move us to love.

Bonaventure described the role of the theologian in the first collation of his *Hexaëmeron* where he wrote: "The theologian considers how the world which was made by God will be brought back to God."[21] In his *Collations on the Holy Spirit*, he warned against those who do theology without putting it into practice, saying that such efforts will do more harm than good.[22] Theology, therefore, is practical knowledge, based on participation of the knowing subject in spiritual realities, which means not simply engaging in intellectual thought but moreover being open to the gifts of the Holy Spirit and advancing in the spiritual life. The purpose of studying theology is to become good in the sense of attaining personal holiness. In the prologue to the first book of his *Sentence Commentary*, Bonaventure describes theology as a *habitus affectivus*, a disposition midway between the speculative and the practical, having as its end both contemplation and personal progress, but mainly personal progress.[23] This *habitus* is called "wisdom," which means at same time both knowledge and love.[24] The basis of theology therefore is personal relationship with God, for only one who is on a journey to God can come to know God, and this knowledge is the path into the mystery of God where knowledge is transformed by love into wisdom.

---

[20] *Brev.* 5.7.4, trans. Dominic Monti, *Breviloquium* (Works of St. Bonaventure) 9 (New York: 2005), 198.

[21] *Hex.* 1.37 (5, 338): *De quo theologus agit, qui considerat, quomodo mundus factus a Deo reducatur in Deum.*

[22] Bonaventure, *De Donis Spiritus Sancti* 4.1 (5, 477).

[23] Carpenter, *Theology as the Road*, 14.

[24] Bonaventure, *Sent.* 1. prooem., q. 3, concl. (1, 13).

The Depths of Mystery

The key to Bonaventure's mystical theology is already contained in the prologue to the first book of the *Sentences* where Bonaventure begins with a verse from the book of Job: "*The depths of rivers he has searched out and hidden things he has brought to light*" (Job 28:11). Emmanuel Falque writes that this verse from the Book of Job "should be interpreted first as a crystallization of all that constitutes the significance of theology, that is, a searching of the depths and a bringing of hidden things to light."[25] On one hand, Falque indicates, the mystery is hidden in the four books of the *Sentences*; on the other hand, the role of the theologian, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, is to search the secrets and depths, as Saint Paul writes: *Spiritus omnia perscrutatur, etiam profunda Dei* (1 Cor. 2:10). The originality of Bonaventure's thought, according to Falque, consists in the way he links the symbolic and the scholastic. While Thomas almost nowhere uses the verse from Job (Job 28:11), Bonaventure makes it the epigraph to his prologue. The "searching of the rivers' depths and the bringing of hidden things to light" define Bonaventure's theological method of *perscrutatio* as "penetrating" or "unveiling." The significance of all theology, therefore, is searching the depths and bringing hidden things to light.

As we already indicated, scripture is the unique source of the entire discourse of theology for Bonaventure, as well as its structure. Because it has its source in God, it is dynamic and flows from God with multiple meanings so that it might appeal to each person. The priority of scripture over theology, which has its source in scripture, tells us about the nature of theology for Bonaventure. It is not a speculative science but the science of revelation. Since the whole of scripture points to Christ, theology is ultimately centered in Christ. Although the priority of scripture suggests that Bonaventure leans towards monastic theology, he does not neglect the rigor of scholastic reasoning. Rather, he connects the scholastic determination of theology as "an affective disposition" midway between the speculative and the practical with the symbol for theology's final cause: the revealing of what lies hidden in God. Whereas Thomas ignores the biblical symbolism of the four rivers from the book of Genesis (Pishon, Gihon, Tigris, and Euphrates), the Seraphic Doctor uses it for the very

[25] Emmanuel Falque, "The Phenomenological Act of *Perscrutatio* in the Proemium of St. Bonaventure's Commentary on the Sentences," trans. Elisa Mangina, *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 10 (2001): 1.

structure of his argument and theology itself.[26] Thus, he juxtaposes the theologian or author of theology with the efficient cause, the action of the Holy Spirit. This union of symbolic and scholastic produces a phenomenological method of "penetration" or *perscrutatio* that is probably unique to theology, and whose specific and exemplary character will be definitely demonstrated when it takes room in the theologian's *affectus.*

Bonaventure relies on the four Aristotelian causes to construct his method of *perscrutatio*. God, who is Trinity, is theology's subject and thus the dynamic source of emanation by which the internal dynamism of any authentic theology expresses itself. The formal cause is the depth dimension of the very subject of theology. Throughout his writings, Bonaventure insists on this dimension of depth as the very thing that simultaneously reveals and veils the divine mystery, which remains hidden and which it is the theologian's task to bring to light. *Perscrutatio* is the action of "uncovering, searching out, penetrating, or fathoming" and thus is the most appropriate theological method for allowing the depth of the mystery to unveil itself without destroying it.[27] Like the "seeker of pearls," thetheologian sent by the Holy Spirit strives to descend to the bottom of the Christian mystery, but the penetration of the mystery is also an inquiry or examination, a method of reasoning. Hence, the theological descent into the depths of the four rivers or the four books of the *Sentences* (the material cause) begins with the method of penetration found in the scholastic reading. The final cause of theology is the affective disposition, that is, desire of the heart inspired by the object toward which it moves. The spirit loves by means of its intelligence only that which it already believes and desires by faith.

The theological method of *perscrutatio* that Bonaventure expounds in his proemium to the *Sentences* is one of bringing to light the depths of things that simultaneously reveal and veil the divine mystery.[28] In a sense, it is related to the method of *reductio* by which all things are returned to God through the light of faith. Bonaventure's method of searching the depths of things is similar to the gaze described by the post-modern philosopher Jean Luc Marion. To talk about the "depth" of some phenomenon is also to talk about its hiddenness at a depth that paradoxically reveals itself only in not showing itself.[29] Marion writes, "depth does not

[26] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 2.
[27] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 9.
[28] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 6.
[29] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 7.

indicate that 'behind' the phenomenon something else would be waiting to appear, but that the very appearing of the phenomenon—as a way [of Being] and therefore as a nonbeing—reveals a depth. The depth does not dub or betray the phenomenon; it reveals it to itself."[30] Similarly, for Bonaventure, the depth of theology as it flows from the mouth of the triune God reveals the mystery of God which is concealed in the depths of creation. The very act of creation discloses the depth of divine mystery, which is concealed in the act of being revealed.

For Bonaventure, *perscrutatio* means allowing the depth of the mystery to unveil itself without destroying it.[31] The theologian who is a *perscrutator* is like a treasure hunter—a seeker of pearls—who fathoms the unsuspected depths of the divine mystery, searching out its inmost hiding places and revealing its most beautiful jewels.[32] Bonaventure indicates that when God expresses something of his Trinitarian grandeur, it is then left to the theologian to search it out or penetrate it insofar as one allows oneself to be inhabited by the wisdom of God which alone brings all things to light.[33] This idea plays out in the life of Francis of Assisi who, as LaNave argues, is the theologian *par excellence* for Bonaventure, and his primary source.[34] Francis, filled with the Holy Spirit and conformed to Christ, contemplated the God of overflowing love in creation. Falque writes that "to discover the hidden order of divine wisdom is not only to search the depths of God in himself but the depth of God hidden in his created works in which and by which he justly manifests his wisdom."[35] Bonaventure elucidates the hiddenness of God in creation in his *Legenda maior* and describes Francis as the true *perscrutator* through the act of contuition, which is a grasp of something in itself and simultaneously in God.

Bonaventure's "method" redirects the novelty of its approach toward the internal disposition of the subject which alone can explain it. The searcher of divine depths must be on the journey to God. Indeed, only one filled with the Spirit can search the depths of God. For Bonaventure, there is no purely speculative conceptual determination. To make the manifestation

---

[30] Jean Luc Marion, *Réduction et donation: Recherches sur Husserl, Heidegger, et la phénoménologie* (Paris: 1989), 63.

[31] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 9.

[32] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 11.

[33] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 12.

[34] According to LaNave, Bonaventure plants the seeds of Francis as theologian in his *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, but the flowering of his thought is shown in his *Legenda maior* and *Hexaëmeron*. See LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 96.

[35] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 13.

of God into a purely speculative act creates confusion. Rather, theology is to make God manifest so as to orient one toward an encounter through love between God and his act of revelation and the human person in one's affective power. Love therefore becomes a conceptual determination at the junction of theory and practice. Thus, "any strictly theo-logical truth, one that has its roots in God, will no longer be content with its unique objective determination. Such a truth," Falque, states, "will take on a performative sense, one that is transforming for the subject that states it, or it will not exist (. . .). Knowledge through love is the only thing that puts in motion whoever comes to know them."[36] Bonaventure's method of *perscrutatio*, the unique integration of symbolic and scholastic, means that spirituality is the key to the depth of the divine mystery. God, who is the source of all theology, is a divine depth to be searched and fathomed by one imbued with the Holy Spirit. The depth of divine mystery and the pursuit of that mystery coinhere in Bonaventure's thought.

The Theologian's Journey into God

If doing theology is searching the depths of God, then doing theology cannot be limited to intellectual study alone; rather, the real task of theology belongs to the life of the Spirit and grace. Nowhere is this more powerfully described than in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, the text that brings together the scholastic and symbolic in a preeminent way. Here the integration of theology and spirituality culminates in mystical union with the crucified Christ. LaNave states: "The *Itinerarium* is Bonaventure's masterwork, an essential complement to the systematic theology of the *Sentences* and *Breviloquium*, the spiritual theology of the *De triplici via*, and the distinctively Franciscan vision of the various *Collationes* and the *Legenda maior*."[37] Although the *Itinerarium* is bracketed by the model of Francis, it is clearly not a biography, but a model of the contemplative and thus, we might say, the true theologian. Francis is the exemplary theologian, the model of ecstatic wisdom who attained mystical union with the crucified Christ. Because theology is inextricably bound up with the life of grace and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, particularly the gift of wisdom, one, like Francis, cannot acquire true theology without the life of the Spirit. The spiritual life reaches its fulfillment in mystical union which is the fruit

[36] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 18.
[37] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 86.

of the grace of contemplation. Carpenter writes: "Mystical union proceeds from contemplation, and contemplation in its turn is effected by the gift of wisdom."[38]

The *Itinerarium* is somewhat deceiving because of its complexity. Bonaventure begins the journey with prayer and desire, and the text appears to be a spiritual path for those who might be overly engaged in theological study. In the prologue he writes:

> I invite the reader to the groans of prayer through Christ crucified (…) so that he not believe that reading is sufficient without unction, speculation without devotion, investigation without wonder, observation without joy, work without piety, knowledge without love, understanding without humility, endeavor without divine grace.[39]

It is only at the end of the journey, after traveling the paths of purgation and illumination, that Bonaventure discloses his secret: the spiritual journey *is* theology, and one who attains the highest stage of this journey will encounter "new, absolute and unchangeable mysteries of theology."[40] Only at the end of this journey do we have insight into the tremendous integration of theology and spirituality that Bonaventure achieves, summed up in his famous lines:

> But if you wish to know how these things come about, ask grace not instruction, desire not understanding, the groaning of prayer not diligent reading, the Spouse not the teacher, God not man, darkness not clarity, not light but the fire that totally inflames and carries us into God by ecstatic unctions and burning affections. This fire is God, and his furnace is in Jerusalem; and Christ enkindles it in the heat of his burning passion.[41]

In a remarkable integration of mystical theology and spirituality, using scholastic and symbolic modes of thought, Bonaventure shapes the *viator* who is the theologian in such a way that the depth of spirituality in one's life corresponds to the depth of theological insight. One who attains the heights of contemplation attains the height of theology, which is the fullness of revelation in the crucified Christ. To appreciate how Bonaventure achieves this remarkable synthesis of theology and spirituality centered in

---

[38] Carpenter, *Theology as the Road*, 33.

[39] Bonaventure, *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* (*Itin.*) prol. 4 (5, p. 296), trans. Ewert Cousins, *Bonaventure: The Soul's Journey into God* (New York: 1978), 55.

[40] *Itin.* 7.5 (5, 313), trans., 114.

[41] *Itin.* 7.6 (5, 313), trans., 115.

the crucified Christ, it is helpful to look at the structure of the *Itinerarium* in its three main parts: God in creation, God within, and God above.

God in Creation

Bonaventure's *Itinerarium* is structured according to Francis' vision of the fiery seraph with its three pair of wings in the form of a crucified man which underlies the account of the stigmata recorded by the biographers. The six wings of the Seraph symbolize the six steps of illumination that begin from creatures and lead up to God, that is, an ascent to God through a consideration of his vestiges outside us, his image within, and those things which are above us. It is a "fiery" seraph because as Hugh of St Victor indicates, this image symbolizes burning love,[42] the love of the crucified Christ which, as we will see, recapitulates the whole of Bonaventure's theology. Bonaventure begins the journey into the depths of divine mystery in the poverty of the desert: *Incipit speculatio pauperis in deserto*. To be in the desert is to be in perfect poverty, to recognize one's creatureliness and thus radical dependency on God. Here one begins to do theology because here one begins the journey to God. Bonaventure writes in his *De perfectione evangelica*: "No one comes to a full notion of God except through a true and proper and notion of himself. No one knows himself unless he recognizes his own nothingness."[43] The human person is in the poverty of the desert simply because she or he is created. Thus, one knows oneself in one's total dependency on God. One's existential poverty is what binds him or her to God and opens him up to God who is the origin of every good gift. Theology begins in the poverty of the desert and the theologian is one who first recognizes his or her dependency on God.

The first step of the journey begins by considering creation, which is good and sacred, flowing like a river from God. The sacred purpose of creation is to awaken the human spirit to God who is Creator. Bonaventure described the created universe as the fountain fullness of God's expressed being. As God expresses himself in creation, creation, in turn, expresses the Creator. We can compare the manifold variety of things in creation to the stain-glassed windows of a great cathedral. Just as light

---

[42] Hugh of St Victor, *Selected Writings*, trans. Community of St. Mary the Virgin (New York: 1963), 54.

[43] Bonaventure, *De perfectione evangelica* (*Perf. ev.*) q. 1, concl. (5, 120–121), trans. Wayne Hellmann, "Poverty: The Franciscan Way to God," *Theology Digest* 22 (1974): 339.

strikes the various panes of glass and diffracts into an array of colors, so too the divine light emanates through the Word and diffracts in the universe, producing a myriad of "colors" expressed in a myriad of things, all reflecting the divine light in some way. Bonaventure used two images to describe creation: mirror and book. As a mirror, creation reflects the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Trinity precisely by the way things express themselves.[44] However, Bonaventure also describes the created world as a book in which its maker, the Trinity, shines forth and is represented at three levels of expression: a trace (vestige), an image, and a likeness.[45] The difference in these levels of expression reflects the degree of similarity between the creature and Creator, the copy and the model. The trace (or vestige) is the most distant reflection of God and is found in all creatures. The image, however, is found only in intellectual (human) beings. It reflects the fact that the human person is not only structured according to the image of the Trinity, but as image, the human person is an apt receptacle for the divine. Bonaventure describes those humans conformed to God by grace as similitudes, since, through grace, they bear a likeness to God. The universe, therefore, appears as a book representing and describing its maker. Every creature is an aspect of God's self-expression in the world, and since every creature has its foundation in the Word, each is equally close to God (although the mode of relationship differs). Since the Word of God is expressed in the manifold variety of creation, Bonaventure views the world as sacramental; it is a symbolic world and one full of signs of God's presence. The world is created as a means of God's self-revelation so that, like a mirror or footprint, it might lead us to love and praise the Creator. We are created to read the book of creation so that we may know the author of life.

The book of creation, according to Bonaventure, was intended by God to be the book of divine wisdom made visible to all. However, this book became unintelligible to humans because of sin.[46] Like a book written in a foreign language, creation became illegible because the human mind, clouded by sin, became enveloped in darkness. In his *Itinerarium*, he writes: "Whoever is not enlightened by such splendor of created things is blind; whoever is not awakened by such outcries is deaf; whoever does not praise God because of all these effects is dumb; whoever does not

[44] *Itin.* 2.1 (5, 300).
[45] *Brev.* 2.12 (5, 230).
[46] *Hex.* 2.20 (5, 340).

discover the First Principle from such clear signs is a fool."[47] When sin rendered this book incomprehensible, Wisdom herself became flesh, so that the book written within (the divine Word) became written without, in the humanity of Jesus Christ. In the Incarnation, the ground of all reality, the divine Word, appeared at the center of creation. The Word who is the truth of all things took flesh and was made known in the person of Jesus Christ. One who knows Christ, therefore, knows the truth of creation as the book of God.

God Within

Because of original sin, Bonaventure indicates, humans lost the ability to contemplate God properly. They became bent over and blinded because they lost the grace necessary for contemplation. Bonaventure writes that "the mirror presented by the external world is of little or no value unless the mirror of our soul has been cleansed and polished."[48] Once we have recognized the divine power, wisdom, and glory in the beauty of creation, we are impelled to enter within, since our desire for God, awakened in creation, cannot be fully satisfied. Bonaventure states that we must enter within the depth of our souls. He writes: "Enter into yourself, then, and see that your soul loves itself most fervently; that it could not love itself unless it knew itself, nor know itself unless it remembered itself, because our intellect grasps only what is present to our memory."[49] Bonaventure, following Augustine, claims that the powers of the soul—memory, intellect, and will—render the soul an image of the Trinity.

"Image," in Bonaventure's view, refers to the relation of the soul to the Trinity, that is, the three powers of memory, intellect and will that conform the soul to God. Image, therefore, does not reside in a part of nature; rather, it belongs to the very nature or structure of the human person.[50] In the third chapter of the *Itinerarium*, he indicates that the soul entering within itself sees the divine image shine forth as in a mirror. In the depths of the soul's faculties, in the memory, intellect and will, one finds a reflection of God. The memory here is taken in the Platonic sense of the depths of the soul where the eternal truths reside; it is the ground of the soul which reflects the presence of God. To say that the soul is image

---

[47] *Itin.* 1.15 (5, 299), trans., 67.
[48] *Itin.* prol. 4 (5, 296), trans., 56.
[49] *Itin.* 3.1 (5, 303), trans., 83.
[50] *II Sent.*, d. 16, a. 2, q. 3, concl. (2, 405).

of God, therefore, means that God is actually in the soul as an object naturally known and loved.[51] Bonaventure further describes the divine image according to the triune powers of memory, intellect, and will by stating: "These powers lead us to the most blessed Trinity itself in view of their order, origin and interrelatedness. From memory, intelligence comes forth as an offspring, since we understand when a likeness which is in the memory leaps into the eye of the intellect in the form of a word. From memory and intelligence, love is breathed forth as their mutual bond."[52] For Bonaventure, the soul as image of the Trinity means that the human person is structured in such a way that she or he is ordered to fulfillment through knowledge and love of God. When the mind knows itself as it truly is and loves itself, there is a genuine image of God in the soul. As a triune image of God, the soul is capable of enjoying the immediate presence of God and is ordered to union with the divine. While Bonaventure uses the Augustinian notion of image to ground the essential relationship between God and human persons, it is only in the explicit turning to the image through knowledge and love that the image of the eternal God in the human person is illuminated.[53] In the depths of the soul's faculties, one finds a reflection of God: "See, therefore, how close the soul is to God, and how through their activity, the memory leads us to eternity, the intelligence to truth and the power of choice to the highest good."[54]

It is in the actualization of the person as image that Bonaventure emphasizes the *Word of God* as true image. In his commentary on the *Sentences*, he distinguishes between the Son of God as image and the human person as image. The Son, he states, is the image of the Father, since it is from the Father that the Son proceeds by nature of the Father's goodness. Because the Son is *from* the Father (*a quo*), the Son is the perfect image and expression of the Father, sharing the same nature and thus expressing the Father totally and completely. While the second Person is the immanent Image of the Father, there is an image of God in the world of creation, and that is the human person. Inasmuch as the human is oriented towards the proper image that is in God, he or she is tending towards the image, whereas the Son, in his whole being, *is* the image of

---

[51] Alvin Black, "The Doctrine of the Image and Similitude in Saint Bonaventure," *Cord* 12 (1962): 270.

[52] *Itin.* 4.5 (5, 307), trans., 84.

[53] Ilia Delio, *Simply Bonaventure: An Introduction to His Life, Thought and Writings* (New York: 2001), 70–71.

[54] *Itin.* 3.4 (5, 305), trans., 84.

the Father. Bonaventure sees the congruent relationship between God and humanity specifically in the relationship between the divine Word and humanity. The human person is an image of God not in the general sense of being "like" God but in the specific sense of being "like" the Son. Thus the human person as a creature is created as an image of the Image.[55] The idea that humans are formed "to the image" rather than "as image" underscores the congruent relationship between humanity and the Word. To say that human persons are created "to the image" (*ad imaginem*) connotes both a structure and a goal, since the Word is the true and perfect image in which humans are created. The incarnation, therefore, becomes the point of departure for understanding the deepest truth about the human person and his or her relation to the divine. The human person is structured according to the one image, Jesus Christ. Christ is the exemplary Image who fills the potential of the created human image. As the Image that becomes an image, Christ is simply *the* exemplar of human personhood because he is *the* Word. No more perfect image of the Image is conceivable.[56] Bonaventure writes that when "our mind contemplates in Christ the Son of God (…) our humanity reaches something perfect."[57]

We have the capacity to know God, but such knowledge can arise only in union with Christ, especially because of the wound of sin. As a result of the fall, our contemplation of God was lost and humanity lay fallen on the ground, immersed in the things of sense and in need of being lifted upright so that one could see oneself as image of God. Christ restores our relationship with God through the obedience of love signified by the cross. Bonaventure uses the term "mediator" to indicate that Christ reconciles the two extremes of God and fallen humanity, although his preferred term is "medium" by which Christ, the center of Trinity and creation, perfects our relationship with God. Bonaventure sees a congruity between the mode of incarnation (the divine Word) and the mystery of creation.[58] By "congruity" Bonaventure means a "factual, positive inner relation between the inner divine reality of the Word, the extra divine reality of the Word and

---

[55] Zachary Hayes, "The Meaning of *Convenientia* in the Metaphysics of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 34 (1974): 90.

[56] Zachary Hayes, *What Manner of Man? Sermons on Christ by St. Bonaventure* (Chicago: 1989), 90 n. 42.

[57] *Itin.* 6.7 (5, 312).

[58] Zachary Hayes, "Incarnation and Creation in the Theology of St. Bonaventure," *in Studies Honoring Ignatius Brady, Friar Minor*, ed. Romano Stephen Almagno and Conrad Harkins (New York: 1976), 311.

the reality of the Incarnation."[59] The incarnation is primarily a mystery of relation.[60] God's creative action places the created human nature of Jesus in a unique relation to the divine. Zachary Hayes writes: "So intense is this relation that the history of Jesus of Nazareth is what the inner Word of God becomes when it is most fully spoken into that which is ontologically other than itself, that is, the human nature of Jesus."[61] The humanity of Jesus is the fullest and most perfect external word that gives expression to the inner, eternal Word as its perfect content.[62] Thus the Word holds a middle place between the Father and the world, and it is through the Son that the Father communicates to the world at all levels. It is precisely as Word and center that the Son is the exemplar of all creation. While at one level, the whole of the Trinity is exemplary with respect to the world, at another level the mystery of exemplarity is concentrated in a unique way in the Son, for the triune structure of God is expressed in him.[63] Thus as the Word is the inner self-expression of God, the created order is the external expression of the inner Word. The created universe, therefore, possesses in its inner constitution a relation to the uncreated Word.

Conformity to Christ

Bonaventure indicates in his *Itinerarium* that we are capable of a transformation through a grace-filled encounter with God when the human soul, like a mirror, is turned to the radiating light of the divine essence. We can know God with a certain amount of certitude because we have within us the divine light. Our knowledge of God does not come entirely from the created world, but is supported by a knowledge of God that is already present within the soul. Bonaventure holds that within the soul there is a changeless light which enables the soul to recall changeless truth.[64] This

---

[59] Hayes, "Incarnation and Creation," 311.

[60] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1 (3, 10); ad 3 (3, 10–11); *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 1, q. 2, ad 2 (3, 13); ad 4 (3, 13); ad 6 (3, 13).

[61] Hayes, "Meaning of *Convenientia*," 78. Hayes notes the conditions for the possibility of incarnation by stating: 1) the two terms of the relation must be capable of entering into such a unique and intense union, 2) there must be a unity of person; for is this were not the case, then the history of Jesus would not be the history of the Word but a history only extrinsically related to the Word, and 3) granted the possibility from the side of God and from the side of man, it is yet required that there be a power adequate to effect the union.

[62] Hayes, "Meaning of *Convenientia*," 77.

[63] *Hex.* 9.2 (5, 373); 3.7 (5, 344).

[64] *Itin.* 3.3 (5, 305). This is Bonaventure's doctrine of illumination, whereby the divine light present in the soul imparts a certitude to the knowledge it conceives. See M. Hurly,

changeless light is the eternal exemplar, and it is by means of this light that we judge all things, including our soul and its reflections. This changeless light is necessary for the soul to arrive at immutable and eternal truth, and it does so by exercising an influence on the human intellect. At the center of the soul, Christ is the inner teacher of truth and the source of divine illumination, because he is the eternal sun, the image of the Father and the splendor of his glory.[65] As the archetype and expression of the three divine Persons, he is the highest reality that can present itself to the intellect, not as an idea or conceptually, but in a profoundly personal relationship realized by the created spirit. Since the archetype freely discloses itself in the copy,[66] it is recognized and acknowledged there as the "inner teacher" when the spiritual impulse toward absoluteness in all intellectual knowing and striving is correctly understood and accepted as the goal.[67] Because of sin, humans were unable to ascend to God; thus, the Word became flesh in order that humans could be lifted up to the inaccessible light. Christ is the true light of knowledge who teaches both interiorly and exteriorly, as Image and exemplar, and is the foundation for every creaturely attitude before God.

Bonaventure uses the term "hierarchy" to describe the illumination of the soul in conformity to Christ through grace. The term "hierarchy" comes from Pseudo-Dionysius and means a "divine order, a knowledge and action assimilated as much as possible to the deiform, and rising proportionately in the likeness of God toward the lights conferred upon it from on high."[68] The purpose of this divine influence is to lead the soul back to God. Bonaventure identifies Christ as the true hierarch, the one who "purifies, illumines and perfects his spouse, that is, the entire church and every holy soul."[69] As the uncreated Word, Christ is the archetype of all God-likeness. As incarnate Word, he is the *medium reducens* who leads

---

"Illumination According to Bonaventure," *Gregorianum* 32 (1951): 388–404; Hayes, introduction to *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, (Works of Saint Bonaventure) 4 (New York: 1992), 57.

[65] *De reductione artium ad theologiam* (*Red. art.*) 18 (5, 324).

[66] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, q. 1, fund. 4 (1, 540).

[67] *Scien. Chr.* 4 (5, 24).

[68] Pseudo-Dionysius, *De coelesti hierarchia* 3.1 (PG 3, 166), trans. Colm Luibheid, *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* (New York: 1987), 153. The Dionysian concept of hierarchy is derived from the Neo-Platonist Proclus. See John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood: 1975), 101–102. For Bonaventure's use of the Dionysian term see *Hex.* 21.17 (5, 434).

[69] *Itin.* 4.5 (5, 307), trans., 91.

fallen creation back to the Father.[70] As hierarch, he is also the *praelatus* who exercises the threefold hierarchic act in human persons to purify, enlighten and perfect them.[71] Since Christ is the center of the soul, he divinely illuminates it through grace, enabling the soul to become hierarchical. As the soul is made hierarchical through Christ the center, it receives the grace of the Holy Spirit, the uncreated gift, the good and perfect gift coming down from the Father of lights through the incarnate Word. It is the grace that comes from Christ that orders the soul in its powers, making it a home for the dwelling place of the Trinity: a daughter of the Father, a spouse of Christ, and a temple of the Holy Spirit.[72] By this threefold path, the soul is lifted up to God as the goal. In being "lifted up" the soul receives divine illuminations, through revelation it knows the secrets of God, and in union it is elevated to ecstasy. Bonaventure describes the hierarchical soul as the soul sealed by the Holy Spirit, the fire of love.[73]

The Ascent to God

Once the soul is restored in conformity to Christ it is able, by divine grace, to be lifted up to contemplate the mystery of God. The gifts of the Holy Spirit help us advance in contemplation, to purify, enlighten and perfect the soul in its hierarchical and contemplative life. As the soul enters more deeply into the mystery of the Word within, it approaches the center where two cherubim face each over the mercy seat, the symbol of Christ crucified. The cherubim represent the highest form of knowing, one concerned with the essential attributes of God, the other with those proper to the Persons of the Trinity. Bonaventure first contemplates God in the unity of his essence and then as a plurality of goodness. Following a Neo-Platonic emphasis on the good, Bonaventure indicates that God is the highest good, than which no greater good can be thought.[74] God's being therefore is goodness. Bonaventure's dynamic Trinity takes as its two principal guides Pseudo-Dionysius and Richard of St Victor. Following Dionysius, Bonaventure considered the name of God in the Old Testament as Being: "I am who Am" (Exod. 3:14). In the New Testament, however,

---

[70] *Red. art.* 8.23 (5, 322, 325); *Brev.* 4.2 (5, 243).
[71] *Itin.* 4.5 (5, 307); *Hex.* 3.12–21 (5, 345–347).
[72] *Brev.* 5.1 (5, 252).
[73] *Hex.* 23.12.14 (5, 446–447).
[74] *Itin.* 6.1 (5, 310).

God reveals himself as good: "No one is good but God alone" (Lk. 18:19; Mk. 10:18).[75] According to Dionysius, the highest good is self-diffusive (*bonum est diffusivum sui*) and gives rise to being.[76] Richard claimed that the highest good is love, and love is personal and communicative.[77] Charity, according to Richard, which is the supreme form of the good, is the basis for showing the necessity of a plurality of Persons in the Godhead. Since charity necessarily involves a relation to another, there can be no charity where there is no plurality. The perfect communication of love, according to Richard, must involve no less than three Persons, since a perfect self-communication would not be possible if God were only one Person, and two Persons could only share love for one another. Hence, "if love by nature involves a relation to another, the highest perfection of love demands that each of the two persons in love share that love with yet another."[78] As Zachary Hayes notes, "there must be in God not only a *dilectum* but a *condilectum* as well. *Condilectio* is found where a third is loved by two in harmony."[79]

Bonaventure draws on Pseudo-Dionysius and Richard of St Victor to describe the Trinity as self-diffusive goodness marked by a community of persons in love. The source of Trinitarian depth is grounded in the nature of the Father or first divine Person as unbegotten self-communicative goodness. The Father is the infinite source of goodness (*fontalis plenitudo*) because the Father is primal and without origin (*innascible*). Because the Father is unbegotten, he is absolutely fecund. The silent depth of the Father's unbegottenness is the dynamic, overflowing source of goodness which is expressed in the Father's generativity. As the fountain fullness of the good, the Father shares his goodness with another. The diffusion of the good into one other than the Father (*per modum naturae*) gives rise to the Son or Word. Since whatever the Father gives is given totally, the Son is everything the Father is in one other than the Father. That is, the Father totally expresses himself in the Son, and expresses himself as creative love. Thus, the Son is referred to as "Word" because all the divine

---

[75] Bonaventure, *Itin.* 5.2 (5, 308).

[76] Pseudo-Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus* 4.1 (PG 3, 694). For an excellent discussion of the tradition see Ewert H. Cousins, "The Notion of the Person in the *De Trinitate* of Richard of St. Victor" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Fordham University: 1966).

[77] Richard of St Victor, *De trinitate* 3.14–19 (PL 196, 924–27).

[78] See Zachary Hayes, introduction to *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity* (Works of St Bonaventure) 3 (New York: 1979), 15–17.

[79] Hayes, introduction to *Disputed Questions*, 17.

ideas of the Father are expressed in the second divine Person. To say that everything is created through the Word is to say that everything shares in the relationship between the Father and the Son; and since this relationship is one of dynamic, eternal goodness, everything shares in the good. The sharing of the good between the Father and the Son is expressed in the Person of the Holy Spirit, who is Gift and bond of love. If the divine Word is the basis of creation, the Spirit is the life of creation breathed forth as the bond of love between the Father and Son. As the center of divine life, the Word is the ontological basis for all that is other than the Father, which, as an expressed Word, is vivified through the life of the Spirit. The possibility of God's creative activity, therefore, rests in his being as triune, which is to say that God could not communicate being to the finite if he were not supremely communicative in himself.[80] Bonaventure writes: "the diffusion in time of creation is not more than a center or point in relation to the immensity of divine goodness."[81] The Word who is the center of the divine life is the exemplar of creation, and creation itself may be seen as an external word in which the one divine Word of the Father is objectified through the life of the Spirit. Since the one Word is the expression of the entire inner-Trinitarian structure of God, that which is created is an expression of the Word which bears within itself the imprint of the Trinity.[82] The Trinity therefore is a dynamic relationship of love; it is "an eternal principle eternally coproducing so that there is a beloved and a co-beloved, the one generated and the other spirated, and this is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."[83] The fecundity of goodness within the Godhead, according to Bonaventure, diffuses by way of the *Word*, in which all things are said, and by way of the *Gift*, in which other gifts are given.[84] "Whatever is possessed is given," Bonaventure writes, "and given completely."[85] This is a key point for Bonaventure, who indicates that the self-communicative nature of God is the total communication of God, which is the meaning of revelation in the Person of Jesus Christ, in whom the Trinity is revealed.

---

[80] Zachary Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure," *Journal of Religion* 58 (1978): 91.

[81] *Itin.* 6.2 (5, 310), trans., 103.

[82] Hayes, "Incarnation and Creation," 314.

[83] *Itin.* 6.2 (5, 310).

[84] *Itin.* 6.2 (5, 310).

[85] *Itin.* 6.3 (5, 311), trans., 105.

Christ Crucified, the *Totum Integrale*

Once the traveler has contemplated the wonderful essence and personal relationships of God, the mind must direct its eyes to the "mercy seat" on top of the ark in order to admire something even more wonderful, the super-admirable union of God and man in the unity of Christ's Person: "For we should wonder not only at the essential and personal properties of God in themselves but also in comparison with the superwonderful union of God and man in the unity of person of Christ."[86] This is the center and synthesis in which the union of God's being and his Trinity expresses itself as the perfect union of the Creator and his creation. Christ is the human icon in which the Word of the origin has become the open book in which all essential truths can be found. Bonaventure sets up a parallel between the coincidence of opposites in the divine nature and the more striking expression in Christ by focusing on the Cherubim turned toward the mercy seat which symbolizes the crucified Christ in whom the triune God is revealed. Christ crucified is the mystery hidden from all eternity (Eph. 3:9), and only one filled with the power of the Holy Spirit, the fire of love, can enter into this mystery. As the soul enters more deeply into the mystery of the Word, it approaches the center and sees that the mystery of Trinity is revealed in Christ.

Although Bonaventure places divine illumination and knowledge of God as a necessary stage in divine contemplation, contemplation is not intellectual knowledge but knowledge through love. In the third book of the *Sentences*, Bonaventure distinguishes between knowledge through grace and knowledge through union. He writes:

> Knowledge of [God] has many levels; God is known in a vestige, he is known in an image, and he is known through the effects of grace. He is also known through the intimate union of God and the soul according to that which the Apostle states: Who adheres to God is one spirit [with him]. And this knowledge is most excellent, as Dionysius teaches, in ecstatic love and rises above the knowledge of faith according to the common state.[87]

---

[86] *Itin.* 6.4 (5, 311), trans., 106.

[87] *III Sent.*, d. 24, dub. 4 (3, 531): *Cognitio viae multos habet gradus; cognoscitur enim Deus in vestigio, cognoscitur in imagine, cognoscitur et effectu gratiae, cognoscitur etiam per intimam unionem Dei et animae, iuxta quod dicit Apostolus: Qui adhaeret Deo unus spiritus est. Et haec cognitio est excellentissima, quam docet Dionysius quae quidem est in cognitione est excellentissima, quam docet Dionysius quae quidem est in ecstatico amore et elevat supra cognitionem fidei secundum statum communem*. The Pauline theme of spiritual union was

The idea that the highest knowledge of God belongs to the will rather than the intellect reflects the fact that love is God's true nature. The human response to God therefore cannot simply be one of intellectual contemplation, but must lead the person into a union of love with the primordial mystery of love, that is, to be led back to the loving relationship between Father and Son. Knowledge of God through its various stages leads us into the mystery of God who is love. In the last chapter of the *Itinerarium*, Bonaventure indicates that as the soul approaches the highest stage of contemplation, the intellect is in darkness. He uses the apophatic theology of Pseudo-Dionysius to say that all intellectual activity must be abandoned and one must pass beyond opposites to the shining ray of divine darkness. He uses the Dionysian terms "superluminous" and "superessential" to highlight the mystery of God as transcendent, incomprehensible love. Ecstasy becomes an intimate experience of God in which the soul touches God in an embrace of love. While contemplation in the lower stages of the journey involves the intellect and will, at this highest stage, contemplation transcends the intellect, since affectivity is higher and more interior than the intellect. In his *Hexaëmeron*, Bonaventure writes: "It is called darkness because it does not bear upon the intelligence, and yet the soul is supremely flooded with light (…). And understand that it is said, not in regard to God, but in regard to our intellect, for the Trinity is substance to a greater degree than our intelligence can perceive."[88]

This knowledge through union draws us out of ourselves by the object of our desire. Our heart longs for beauty and we yearn to experience God in te fullest way possible. Thus, we must contemplate Christ precisely as God-man in order to reach *excessus mentis*, that knowledge of God that is an experience of the love of God or experiential wisdom. All intellectual activity must be abandoned and one must pass beyond opposites to the shining ray of divine darkness: "In this passing beyond, if it is perfect, it is necessary that all intellectual operations be left behind and that the *apex affectionis* be totally transferred and transformed into God. This is *mystical and secret*."[89] Thus, the mind is asleep but the heart is awake. In ecstasy, one truly feels more than knows. Knowledge which leads to God leads us to the heart of God as love, since love and knowledge are one in

---

a favorite of Bernard of Clairvaux who used it in his *Sermon* 83 to describe union with the divine Word.

[88] *Hex*. 2.32 (5, 342), trans. José de Vinck, "Collations on the Six Days," (Works of St Bonaventure) 5 (Paterson: 1970), 38–39.

[89] *Itin*. 7.4 (5, 311), trans., 113.

the experience of God. In this loving union, *excessus mentis*, God is experienced as Trinity. One who is inflamed by the Spirit of love passes over in Christ to the silent hidden depths of the Father, who is the fountain fullness of love. This experience of God through love transcends the intellect and is procured under the grace of the Holy Spirit, the finger of the living God who searches the depths of God; thus, it is an experiential knowledge of God ("tasting") that is a union of love.

Here, at this level, Bonaventure's mystical theology attains its height, for he realizes that the Trinity of love is poured out in the mystery of the crucified Christ, and only through the mystery of Christ do we enter into the heart of the Trinity. The crucified Christ, as LaNave points out, is the *totum integrale* of theology;[90] all that theology seeks to know can be found in the crucified Christ.[91] With arms outstretched, the embrace of Christ crucified in a broken world is the fullest expression of the humility of God. For Bonaventure, the humility of God is expressed most fully as the power of God's love in and through suffering and death. The centrality of the cross signifies a God who is radically involved with the world and ultimately concerned for the world's completion in love. The *theôsis*

---

[90] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 120. LaNave writes: "We have moved beyond the *Sentences* here in that it is no longer the *totus Christus* that appears as the *totum integrale* of theology, but the Crucified (. . .) the remarkable thing about the *Itinerarium* is that it firmly fixes this conviction within theology itself." Carpenter notes, however, that in the midst of his speculative explications about the nature of theology, Bonaventure suddenly introduces the image of the crucified Christ. In the prologue to the first book of the *Sentences*, Bonaventure writes: *Talis est cognitio tradita in hoc libro. Nam cognition haec iuvat fidem, et fides sic est in intellectu, ut, quantum est de sui ratione, nata sit movere affectum. Et hoc patet. Nam haec cognitio: quod Christus pro nobis mortuus est, et consimiles, nisi sit homo peccator et durus, movet ad amorem; non sic ista: quod diameter est asymeter costae. Concedendum ergo, quod est, ut boni fiamus* (*I Sent*., prooem., q. 3, resp. [1, 13]). Carpenter concludes: "The very object of our theological study is an image that moves us to love, by its very nature (*nata sit movere affectum*). Evidently the purpose of theology (*ut boni fiamus*) is attained by this loving approach of the theologian to Christ, the center of all theology, and the symbol which carries us to God. If theological study is a spiritual life, such a spirituality is christocentric." See Carpenter, *Theology as Road*, 77.

[91] In *I Sent*., d. 19, p. 2, a. un., q. 1 (1, 335) Bonaventure addresses the question "whether in the divinity there is an integral whole" (*Utrum in divinis ponendum sit totum integrale*). It may be said that a *totum integrale* is a whole of which the parts are ordered to each other, yet are also to be considered as retaining their own proper natures. The Quaracchi editors note that in a *totum integrale* the whole is predicated of all parts at the same time, but of no one part per se. LaNave (*Through Holiness*, 38 n. 25) states: "The significance of a *totum integrale* for a *scientia* will be all the greater as it presents a greater degree of unity and necessity. The more united it is, the more it provides a definite shape for the *scientia*, in the manner of a final cause." Elsewhere he writes: "Therefore, in theology one may call Christ the final cause because the material that he contains (God and man, head and members) is in him ordered to form a single object" (41).

(divinization) of mortals, therefore, is realized in God's mortality. Encountering God is not an escape from corporeality, but the acceptance of mortality as a symbol and concretization of absolute generosity and self-communication. To journey into God is to become one with the Crucified. The knowledge of God which draws us beyond ourselves impels us to leave behind the intellect and understanding and to rely only on desire, the fire of the Spirit within; here the mind gives way to the heart, and we are drawn to the One whom we can never fully understand but whom we desire from the depths of our being. Bonaventure speaks of this union as a "mystical death" brought about through the grace of the Holy Spirit. He writes: "Whoever loves this death can see God. Let us, then, die and enter into the darkness; let us impose silence upon our cares, our desires and our imaginings. With Christ Crucified let us pass out of this world to the Father."[92] This mystical death, for Bonaventure, is a "dying into the Trinity," being drawn into the mystery of the Father through the power of the Spirit's love flowing from the passion of the crucified Christ. The incarnate and crucified Word who expresses the Father's power, wisdom, and goodness in creation becomes the manifestation of his overflowing love on the cross. As the center between the Father and creation, Christ draws the human person into affective union with the Father. Bonaventure writes: "With Christ Crucified let us pass out of this world to the Father so that when the Father is shown to us, we may say with Philip: It is enough for us (. . .). You are the God of my heart."[93] At this highest stage of mystical union with the crucified Christ, theology is perfected, for the knowledge of God becomes the experience of God, as one passes over into the silent hidden depths of the Father through the love of the Spirit and the humanity of Christ. The *viator*/theologian is now grasped, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, by the dominance of love.

Wisdom, the Logic of the Cross

Bonaventure's *Itinerarium* is an ever-deepening plunge into the divine mystery, from the exemplary world of creation to the human soul created as *imago Dei*, and finally into God as Trinity. It is precisely at the level of the Trinity that the seeker of truth is led not to an abstract or speculative determination of God, but to the crucified humanity of Christ.

---

[92] *Itin.* 7.6 (5, 312), trans., 116.
[93] *Itin.* 7.6 (5, 312), trans., 116.

Bonaventure works through the dynamic Trinity of personal relationships and concludes that the fullness of Trinitarian love is expressed in the crucified Christ. In Bonaventure's view, this is the meaning of the crucified Christ. Only the one who is shaped to the humility of Christ and illumined by divine grace can let go of human logic and be transformed in the wisdom or logic of the cross, for the cross is the hidden wisdom of God. The end of the spiritual journey, which is the end of theology, for Bonaventure, is ecstatic wisdom, the wisdom of God revealed in the crucified Christ.

Wisdom is the principle of knowing; it is light, mirror, exemplar, book of life. As the knowledge and right ordering of all things, wisdom is "utterly simple and perfect" and therefore can arise from no other than God.[94] Wisdom belongs uniquely to the Word of God; as the *medium* of the Trinity, the Word lies between the Father and Spirit, rendering order and unity to the Trinity. In creation, the crucified Word is the revelation of God's wisdom where God reaches down to the depths of the world and draws all things back to himself. In his commentary on the *Sentences*, Bonaventure states that wisdom is an experiential knowledge of God that begins with contemplation or a vision of God as the source of all created reality and culminates in "tasting God," which is a union of love that is agapic or compassionate. Wisdom is the most excellent gift of the Holy Spirit and unites the soul with Christ through contemplation. As Bonaventure points out in his spiritual writings, one does not attain wisdom through effort alone; one acquires wisdom through the gifts of the Holy Spirit.[95] Wisdom bears many fruits, including recognition of one's inner defects, control of the passions, ordaining of thoughts, and elevation of desire. The gift of wisdom from above is the light which descends to illuminate our cognitive potency, to gladden our affective potency, and to fortify our operative potency. Bonaventure speaks of wisdom as a certain disposition of the soul, a *habitus*, by which the mind can apprehend the wisdom of God.[96]

---

[94] *Brev*. 1.8 (5, 216).

[95] At the conclusion of his *Lignum vitae*, Bonaventure prays for the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, beginning with the gift of wisdom. The prayer is address *to* the "most kind Father" *through* "his only-begotten Son, who for us became man, was crucified and glorified," *for* "the Spirit of sevenfold grace who rested upon you in all fullness." Bonaventure therefore affirms the crucified Christ as the *totum integrale* of theology, and wisdom as the highest gift of the Spirit by which "we may taste the life-giving flavors of the fruit of the tree of life, which You truly are." See Cousins, *Bonaventure*, 174.

[96] For a more detailed discussion on the types and properties of wisdom see Christopher Cullen, *Bonaventure* (New York: 2006), 23–35; LaNave, *Through Wisdom*, 147–92.

Although wisdom has several forms which Bonaventure describes in his second collation on the *Hexaëmeron*, the highest form of wisdom, contemplative wisdom, entails a love that transcends all understanding and knowledge, a "formless wisdom" (*sapientia nulliformis*). This wisdom of God, he claims, "is mysterious, hidden (…) which (…) eye has not seen nor ear heard, nor has it entered into the heart of man (…). But to us God has revealed [it] through His Spirit. For the Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God."[97] This is the wisdom of the *perscrutator*, which is attained through the grace of contemplation and the supreme union of love. "Such love," according to Bonaventure, "transcends every intellect and science."[98] "In this union," he continues, "the mind is joined to God, wherefore in a certain sense it sleeps (…). Only the affective power keeps vigil and imposes silence upon all the other powers."[99] To plumb the depths of mystical theology is, for Bonaventure, to attain wisdom or that highest union in love which is an experiential and thus more perfect knowledge of God marked by silence and death. Bonaventure writes:

> Now such love divides, puts to sleep, and lifts up. It divides, since it cuts away from any other love because of the single love for the Spouse; it puts to sleep and appeases all the powers and imposes silence; it lifts up, since it leads to God. And so man is dead, where it is said: *Love is strong as death* (Cant. 8:6), because it cuts away from all things. Man, then, must die of this love in order to be lifted up.[100]

The metaphors of sleep, silence and death indicate that this highest form of wisdom comes about through transformation in the cross. The cross is the disclosure of God's wisdom in a formless form, symbolized by the death of Christ. What appears fragile and broken is the outpouring love of the Trinity; the shattering of Christ's body is the release of the costly ointment of divine wisdom. Although God's wisdom is light, it is revealed in darkness, silence, suffering and death. Only one who is conformed to the Crucified through poverty and humility can see this light, because one participates, through imitation of Christ, in the fragile form of God's self-involving love. One must be on the spiritual journey to God to know the depths of God's love expressed in the depths of the cross. That is, one cannot *know* God in himself, but as he *reveals* himself, that is, one must

---

[97] *Hex*. 2.28 (5, 340–341), trans., 35.
[98] *Hex*. 2.30 (5, 341), trans., 36.
[99] *Hex*. 2.30 (5, 341), trans., 36–37.
[100] *Hex*. 2.31 (5, 341), trans., 37.

experience God "for the Trinity is *substance* to a greater degree than our intelligence can perceive."[101] Bonaventure writes: "For Christ goes away when the mind attempts to behold this wisdom through intellectual eyes; since it is not the intellect that can go in there, but the heart."[102] If Christ crucified is the *totum integrale* of theology, then theology—the logic of God—is the logic of self-involvement and thus a kenosis of one's self. The wisdom of the cross, which reveals the wisdom of God, shatters all other forms of knowledge and opens one up to the depth of mystery. Thus, the theologian must be transformed into the love of the Crucified to enter into what is disclosed as lasting and true.

Francis, the Model Theologian

In his *Hexaëmeron* Bonaventure claims that *scientia* passes over into *sapientia* by means of *sanctitas*,[103] or, as LaNave concludes, "the theologian who possesses a sapiential theology is none other than a saint."[104] In view of the relationship between theology and holiness, Bonaventure holds up Francis as a theologian; indeed, as *the* exemplary theologian marked by the stigmata. Although Bonaventure does not explicitly identify Francis as a theologian, the depth of theology described in his *Legenda maior* and *Itinerarium* suggests that Francis, the model for each text, is the true theologian, the one who came to know God in the depths of his life and in the depths of creation.[105] The organizing center of Francis' theology is the crucified Christ. Francis perceived in the cross something of the very heart

---

[101] *Hex*. 2.32 (5, 342), trans., 39.

[102] *Hex*. 2.32 (5, 342), trans., 39.

[103] *Hex*. 19.3 (5, 420). Bonaventure writes: *Non est ergo securus transitus a scientia ad sapientiam; oportet ergo medium ponere, scilicet sanctitatem*.

[104] LaNave, *Through Holiness*, 192.

[105] In *The Flowering of Mysticism: Men and Women in the New Mysticism—1200–1350* (New York: 1998), 21, Bernard McGinn describes Francis of Assisi as a "vernacular" theologian, thus distinguishing a type of theology alongside that of monastic and scholastic theology. The primary characteristic of vernacular theology, according to McGinn, is the linguistic expression in the medieval vernacular tongue. For those untrained in formal theology, such as Francis, the authority to teach came about not *ex officio* but rather *ex beneficio* or by the gift of grace. See also Dominic Monti, "Francis as Vernacular Theologian: A Link to the Franciscan Intellectual Tradition?" in *The Franciscan Intellectual Tradition*, ed. Elise Saggau (New York: 2002), 21–42. It is interesting to note that LaNave (*Through Holiness* 145) does not treat Francis as a vernacular theologian but states: "Bonaventure regards Francis (…) as a distinctive source and model of theology." Elsewhere he writes: "Francis is an author of theology (i.e., a theologian) in Bonaventure's view and on that basis (…) his influence [is] a source of Bonaventure's theology" (199).

of God as self-sacrificing love that holds onto nothing for itself. Hans Urs von Balthasar writes that love is that "incomprehensible passing over from itself into what is other than itself."[106] It was this most profound poverty of spirit that opened Francis to receive and be transformed by divine love. This transformation was so radical that it impressed itself not only in his spirit but also in his flesh in the form of the stigmata. The imitation of Christ in total poverty became the imitation of a God who is poor. And the spirituality of the imitation of Christ, at its core, took the form of a love that surrenders everything for the sake of the other.[107] Francis the theologian, according to Bonaventure, *was* Francis the *alter Christus*; for he was conformed to Christ and filled with the Spirit of God and hence the life of God.

Bonaventure conceived the life of Francis as one imbued with the wisdom of God. The beauty of wisdom, he states, appeared to Francis in the form of the crucified seraph—outwardly it appeared disfigured and distorted, inwardly it was illuminating. The stigmata, he writes, were proof that Christian wisdom was "ploughed into his flesh" by the "finger of God," which is the power of the living Spirit of God.[108] Through the deepening of his life in the Spirit, Francis became conformed to Christ and thus to the wisdom of the Father, by which he came to see the beauty of creation as the expression of an infinitely loving God.

Bonaventure viewed the life of Francis as a growth in awareness of divine goodness at the heart of the world in and through the mystery of Christ. His story of Francis' life is framed by Francis' encounter with the crucified Christ, where he highlights Christ's appearance to Francis in the visible form of the cross. In encountering Christ crucified, Francis met the God of humble love. This meeting became the basis of encountering God in creation, in the particularity of the human person, and in the family of creatures where the humility of God was expressed. This encounter with Christ crucified changed Francis in the very core of his being. "From then on," Bonaventure wrote, "he clothed himself with a spirit of poverty, a sense of humility, an eagerness for intimate piety."[109] The expression of

---

[106] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 2, trans. Andrew Louth, Francis McDonagh and Brian McNeil (San Francisco: 1984), 359.

[107] Zachary Hayes, "Bonaventure of Bagnoregio: A Paradigm for Franciscan Theologians?" in *The Franciscan Intellectual Tradition*, ed. Elise Saggau (New York: 2002), 44–45.

[108] *Legenda maior* (*Leg. maj.*) 13.10.

[109] Bonaventure, "The Major Legend of Saint Francis," 1.6, in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*, vol. 2 (hereafter: *FAED* 2) ed. Regis J. Armstrong, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, and William J. Short (New York: 2000), 534.

God's love in the self-emptying of the cross impressed Francis in such a way that those who had been loathsome to him in his youth, namely, the lepers, became the object of his love. In his *Major Legend of Saint Francis*, Bonaventure says that "after Francis was impressed with the passion of Christ he (…) showed deeds of humility and humanity to lepers with a gentle piety (…) with a great drive of *compassion* [he] kissed their hands and mouth."[110] The experience of God's compassionate love in the crucified Christ meant that Francis could no longer remain alone in his search for God. Rather, he found God in relation to the other. The encounter with Christ as other, therefore, imparted to Francis a new openness and freedom. Embraced by the compassionate love of God, Francis was liberated within and went out to embrace the other in love. By experiencing God's love in the visible figure of the Crucified, Francis became a man of true relationship.

Bonaventure highlights the idea that through his relationship with Christ, Francis came to realize his "family" relatedness to everything, including the tiny creatures of creation. "True piety," Bonaventure writes, "had so filled Francis's heart and penetrated its depths that it seemed to have claimed the man of God completely into its dominion. This is what, through devotion, lifted him up to God; through compassion, transformed him into Christ; through self-emptying, turned him to his neighbor; through universal reconciliation with each thing, refashioned him to the state of innocence."[111] Francis' piety was the fruit of his ongoing conversion. Growing in union with Christ through the Spirit gave Francis a new relationship to a new nature, one in which grace and innocence prevailed, not sin and conflict. His piety was the source of his reverence for animals, and he recognized them as fellow creatures and signs of Christ.

The life of Francis gave new meaning to the divine command of dominion found in the book of Genesis (Gen. 1:28). He did not consider himself at the top of a hierarchy of being, nor did he declare himself superior to the non-human creation. Rather, Francis saw himself as a brother, one related to the family of creation. His spirituality overturned the spirituality of hierarchical ascent and replaced it with a spirituality of descending

---

[110] *Leg. maj.* 1.6 (*FAED* 2, 534). The editors of this volume indicate that Bonaventure uses the word *compassio* five times in the text suggesting more than *miseratio* (an act of kindness) or *misericordia* (a heart sensitive to suffering). Compassion (*com-passio*) has the sense of suffering with another.

[111] *Leg. maj.* 8.1 (*FAED* 2, 586).

solidarity between humanity and creation.[112] That is, instead of using creatures to ascend to God (in a transcending manner), he found God in all creatures and identified with them as brother and sister. Bonaventure writes "he would call creatures, no matter how small, by the name of 'brother' or 'sister' because he knew they shared with him the same beginning."[113] Bonaventure claims that everything in creation "spoke" to Francis of God. He came to "see" God's goodness in every aspect of creation, so that everything ultimately led him to Christ, the Word of God. Francis' contemplation of God in creation was a penetrating gaze of reality. He came to "see" the truth of things by following the footprints of Jesus Christ. Bonaventure describes the contemplative vision of Francis as "contuitive," that is, seeing things for what they truly are in God. In his *Major Legend of Francis* he writes:

> Aroused by everything to divine love, he rejoiced in all the works of the Lord's hands and through their delightful display he rose into their life-giving reason and cause. In beautiful things he contuited Beauty itself and through the footprints impressed in things he followed his Beloved everywhere, out of them all making for himself a ladder through which he could climb up to lay hold of him who is utterly desirable. With an intensity of unheard devotion he savored in each and every creature—as in so many rivulets—that fontal Goodness, and discerned an almost celestial choir in the chords of power and activity given to them by God.[114]

Bonaventure uses the term "contuition" to convey the divine depth of created reality. It is the contemplative gaze that both sees the object for what it is and knows it in its God-centered reality. The ability to contuit the things of creation suggests that creation is saturated with the goodness of God. Depth does not reflect the quality of being itself, but the quality of being in its character as word. Hence the mystical or concealed God is one who is revealed to the eyes of the wise person. Here we could say with the philosopher Martin Heidegger that Being gives itself as withdrawal, it "lights up" without becoming a being. Beings points to Being in which Being itself recedes as it appears. That which exists or expresses itself

---

[112] Timothy Vining, "A Theology of Creation Based on the Life of Francis of Assisi," *The Cord* 40 (1990): 105.

[113] *Leg. maj.* 8.6 (*FAED* 2, 590).

[114] *Leg. maj.* 9.1 (*FAED* 2, 596–597).

points to something other than what it is, something which is beyond it, and yet integrally part of it.[115]

In Bonaventure's view, Francis' depth-seeing was not merely a passive seeing, but a deep penetrating gaze of the truth of the other. The power of seeing for Francis was at the same time a desire for God. Through the life of Francis, Bonaventure indicates that God is turned toward us in love. God is not a remote, self-sufficient Being. Rather, God is the fecundity of goodness and the humility of love that seeks to share himself with another. This idea is consistent with the postmodern understanding of God. The contemporary philosopher Jean Luc Marion claims that the name "God" does not mean Being but "Being as given." He writes: "the donation of God par excellence implies an ecstasy outside itself in which the self remains all the more itself for being in ecstasy (. . .). God acts only to the extent that he does not remain in himself."[116] We see, in Bonaventure's life of Francis, the depth of the incarnation in the richness of its diversity, as Francis discovers Christ in the poor, the sick, the lepers, and the tiny creatures of creation. Not only did Francis "see" God reflected in the particularity of the other, according to Bonaventure, but the other revealed to him something of the truth of God. Francis came to know God in relation to the other.

Although knowledge plays an important role in Francis's life, as he sought to know God through a life of prayer and penance, it is love that led him into the heart of God. For Bonaventure, only the heart turned toward God can penetrate the depths of the mystery of God through the inner eye of wisdom. The theologian, like Francis, who desires to know God and the things of God must be inflamed by love and go beyond mere human logic into the heart of the other where the logic of God prevails. God is the incomprehensible *mystery* of love, signified by the silence, darkness and death; thus, one must be endowed with grace and the gifts of the Spirit to go beyond oneself into the heart of the other. Francis attained this level of love, according to Bonaventure, and became, like Christ, an icon of Trinitarian self-communicative love. In light of Francis, Bonaventure indicates that knowledge deepened by love marks the true theologian.

---

[115] Leonard Bowman, "Bonaventure's 'Contuition' and Heidegger's 'Thinking': Some Parallels," *Franciscan Studies* 37 (1977): 28. Bowman defines contuition as "a grasp of a perceived thing in relation to its causes, especially to its exemplary cause, the Word" (24).

[116] Jean-Luc Marion, "Metaphysics and Phenomenology: A Summary for Theologians," in *The Postmodern God: A Theology Reader*, ed. Graham Ward (Malden: 1997), 292.

Metaphysics of Christ the Center

If spirituality and theology form a unity in Bonaventure's thought, it is because knowledge and love coinhere in the relationship to God. Knowledge of theology can never be the property of reason alone, for that which is born of God is to teach us and lead us back to God.[117] Bonaventure maintained that the more rational activity, the more grace of divine illumination is needed, for "grace is the foundation of penetrating enlightenment of reason."[118] Theology begins not with the grasp of understanding, but in the poverty of the desert, the desire for God and the prayerful ascent to God, leading to holiness and the habit of wisdom. In the words of Evagrius Ponticus, "the theologian is one who prays and one who prays is a theologian."[119] This integral relation between faith and reason, spirituality and theology, suggests an integral relationship between "being" and "doing." The theologian is not first one who "does theology," but one who lives theology. Bonaventure's integral synthesis of spirituality and theology involves an ongoing spiritual formation of seeking God with all one's heart which is transformative and enlightening and hence a searching of the depths of God. Theology, in Bonaventure's view, means becoming a *theological person*, as he described in the life of Francis of Assisi.

To appreciate Bonaventure's synthesis we must revisit the relation of theology to philosophy, for it is here that Bonaventure distinguishes himself and establishes the foundation of his synthesis. As I indicated at the beginning, Bonaventure did not entirely dismiss the sufficiency of reason or assert that philosophy is impossible without faith, but he held that all (pagan) philosophy stands open to correction in light of the New Testament.[120] To philosophize is to recognize that we are seekers rather than possessors or builders of total truth. He did not deny the necessity or usefulness of human knowledge, especially philosophical knowledge, in reflection on faith. His only criticism was of a use of reason that claimed self-sufficiency and completeness, as having already reached the goal.

---

[117] Regis Armstrong indicates that in the Middle Ages, theology was to "teach of God, to be taught by God and to lead to God" (*theologia Deum docet, a Deo docetur, ad Deum ducit*). See Regis J. Armstrong, "Francis of Assisi and the Prisms of Theologizing," *Greyfriars Review* 10 (1994): 179.

[118] *Itin.* 1.8 (5, 298): *Sicut igitur gratia fundamentum est rectitudinis voluntatis et illustrationis perspicuae rationis.*

[119] Evagrius Ponticus, *The Praktikos: Chapters on Prayer*, trans. John Eudes Bamberger (Spencer: 1970).

[120] Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics," 93.

Kevin Hughes views Bonaventure's theological metaphysics as a salve to the modern wounding of metaphysics and its critique in ontotheology.[121] He writes, "Bonaventure's concerns are not against Aristotelian categories or against scholastic method or philosophy per se, but rather against a love of categories of rationality and method that exceeds their grasp and becomes disordered."[122]

Bonaventure describes a theological metaphysics in the first *collatio* of his *Hexaëmeron*, where he begins by describing the Trinitarian relationships. As the Father expresses all that he is in the Word, so too, the procession of the Spirit is expressed in the Word in such a way that the Word appears as the point at which the entire triune structure of the divine life is focused in an exemplary way.[123] Bonaventure works through the mystery of the Trinity in Christ and concludes that Christ is the metaphysical center, the ground of all created reality, because Christ is the total expression of the Father, the fullness of divine love, and the eternal art. True knowledge, therefore, is no longer associated with objective universals; rather, it is now identified on the level of the singular, the person of Jesus Christ. If the Image of all images is an individual, then the primary significance of individual form no longer consists in disclosing a universal reality beyond itself. Indeed, the universal itself ultimately refers to the singular.[124] The revolution of Bonaventure's metaphysics is the triumph of the ontological singular and personal over the universal. True knowledge lies in the uniqueness of the individual, which can be known only through personal relationship. In Christ, the principle of being is the principle of knowing.[125]

Bonaventure's metaphysics plays out on the level of creation. The Word, who is the center of divine life, is the exemplar of creation, so that creation becomes the external word that gives expression to the one inner Word. As Ewert Cousins observed, "exemplarity through the Word is the center of Bonaventure's system and the basis for the intimate interpenetration

---

[121] Kevin L. Hughes, "Remember Bonaventure? (Onto)Theology and Ecstasy," *Modern Theology* 19 (2003): 539. Hughes identifies ontotheology as "that ultimate knowledge which is a form of mastery or control (. . .) it is curiosity and, ultimately, idolatrous, since it takes comprehension to be the measure of all knowledge and takes 'God' to be the object of its comprehension."

[122] Hughes, "(Onto)Theology," 541.

[123] *Hex.* 1.14 (5, 331); Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics," 90.

[124] Louis Dupré, *Passage to Modernity: An Essay in the Hermeneutics of Nature and Culture* (New Haven: 1993), 38.

[125] *Hex.* 1.13 (5, 331).

of God and the world."[126] In the free divine action of creation, the Trinitarian fullness of divine goodness "explodes" into creatures which are not God, but are God's self-expression.[127] Thus, in Bonaventure's view, every creature is understood as an aspect of God's self-expression in the world. Every creature reflects the Word and wisdom of God, the divine exemplar. God is profoundly present to all things, and God is expressed in all things, so that each creature is a symbol and a sacrament of God's presence and Trinitarian life.[128] How do we come to know this world as Trinitarian love? For Bonaventure, the truth of created reality is revealed in Jesus Christ. Christ, the Word of God, is the center of reality, and it is from this center that one should begin the inquiry concerning the nature of reality. He writes: "Such is the metaphysical center that leads us back, and this is the whole of our metaphysics; namely, it is concerned with emanation, exemplarity and consummation, that is, to be illumined by means of spiritual light and be led back to the Highest Being."[129]

Bonaventure's metaphysics of Christ the center, according to Hayes, is intended to correct that which had been inherited from the Greek philosophers. The classical Greek doctrine of being established the one divine essence as the exemplary cause of created being, a transcendent cause that, at best, could be a principle, but not related to created being.[130] Bonaventure's deep reflection on the prologue of John's Gospel allowed him to see the metaphysical and epistemological implications of the Word, incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ. The Word is not only the Father's self-expressiveness; it is the relation of God to creation, humanity, and the scriptures. As Hayes writes, "that which the philosopher sought as the exemplary cause and found in the one divine essence, the theologian comes to know as the person of the Word, the center of divine life and the exemplar in whom the whole Trinitarian structure of divine nature expresses itself as the exemplar of all finite reality."[131] "Since all things are constituted in being through the Word, and if it is impossible to understand a creature except through that by which it is made, then

---

[126] Ewert Cousins, "Response to Zachary Hayes," *Journal of Religion* 58 (Supplement, 1978): 101.

[127] Denis Edwards, "The Discovery of Chaos and the Retrieval of the Trinity," in *Chaos and Complexity: Scientific Perspectives on Divine Action* (Rome: 1995), 161–162; Leonard Bowman, "The Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," *Journal of Religion* 55 (1975): 182–183.

[128] Edwards, "Discovery of Chaos," 163.

[129] *Hex*. 1.1, 17 (5, 329, 332), trans., 1, 10.

[130] Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics," 98–99.

[131] Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics," 91.

in some way the Word is involved in all genuine knowledge at whatever level."[132]

Bonaventure did not reject the classical doctrine of being; however, he reframed it in light of revelation. He grounds the mystery of Christ in the metaphysics of divine self-relatedness which is the Trinity. The Father begets the Son through the self-communication of love, and with the Son breathes forth love in the Spirit. It is out of this creative love that all other created reality flows. Hayes writes, "The metaphysical question coincides with the Christological question in as far as the problem of exemplarity which is focused in metaphysics at the philosophical level is related to the exemplarity of the Word incarnate in Jesus Christ (. . .). God speaks but one Word in which the world and its history are co-spoken (. . .). There is, however, a point in history at which the content of that Word is historicized with such explicitness that from that point light is shed on all of reality,"[133] and that point is Christ the center. Since this Word is the Word of eternal love spoken in history, it is reasonable to suggest that Bonaventure's metaphysics of Christ the center is a metaphysics of love. In light of Christ, Bonaventure views the exemplary nature of created reality not as being but as love. True knowledge of created reality, therefore, is not rooted in the intellect, but in love, and hence is personal and relational. Thus, as Falque writes, "any strictly *theo*-logical truth, one that has its roots in God, will no longer be content with its unique objective determination. One the contrary, such a truth will take on a performative sense, one that is transforming for the subject that states it, or it will not exist."[134]

Bonaventure's metaphysics assumed a distinct formulation through reflection on the life of Francis, in whom the height of knowledge was attained through union with Christ crucified. In light of Francis, Bonaventure combined piety and knowledge, faith and reason, and indicated that even if one comes to know God and arrives at the height of intellectual knowledge of God (as that than which no greater can be thought), there is more to knowledge than what enters the mind. To know beyond knowing or to attain that knowledge beyond knowledge is, as Hughes states, to "shut up and pray."[135] Love goes further than knowledge, and the type of love that is the highest knowledge for Bonaventure is wisdom, which imposes

---

[132] Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics," 92.
[133] Hayes, "Christology and Metaphysics," 88–92.
[134] Falque, "Phenomenological Act," 18.
[135] Hughes, "(Onto)Theology," 541.

silence on the intellect and appeases all its powers.[136] True knowledge (indeed, theology itself) entails a death to the self-grasping intellect. One must become as dead in order to see into the heart of things, as Francis did in his lifetime. In his *Itinerarium*, Bonaventure describes Francis as one who passed over into the silence and darkness of the incomprehensible love of God through union with the crucified Christ. Francis's dying into love was a stripping away of everything that prevented him from being grasped by the dominance of grace, which opened his eyes to truth through a union in love. Bonaventure viewed the ontological death of the crucified incarnate Word as the revelation of the Trinity and hence as mystery of the world. In reflecting on Francis' life, he indicated that one can know this truth only by accepting the poverty of our creatureliness, by acknowledging our dependency on God, and by accepting death as the path into the heart of God. Only one who can let go of possessing knowledge can really know this world as a Trinity of love unfolding in its fullness, which Christ reveals in the depth of the cross.

Bonaventure's focus on Christ crucified as the metaphysical center underscores the power of God's unconditional love.[137] If God is a Trinity of love, then the Trinity expresses itself in history in the utter self-emptying of the Crucified. God is most "God-like" in the cross, where the metaphysical center shows itself in love unto death. True knowledge therefore is bound up with death, and unless one is willing to "die to the ego" to attain union with the other, truth remains elusive. For Bonaventure, truth is not a given but must be arrived at; it is not a "thing" but a disclosure. True knowledge is attained through union in love, and without love there is no truth and hence no real grasp of true reality. One must be on the journey into love to know the God of love.

---

[136] *Hex*. 2.31 (5, 341). Bonaventure writes: "Now such love (…) puts to sleep and appeases all the powers and imposes silence; it lifts up since it leads to God. And so man is dead, wherefore it is said: Love is as strong as death, because it cuts away from all things" (trans., 37).

[137] Walter Kasper aptly describes the cross as the full disclosure of God in history: "On the cross the incarnation of God reaches its true meaning and purpose (…). The cross is the utmost that is possible to God in his self-surrendering love; it is 'that than which a greater cannot be thought;' it is the unsurpassable self-definition of God (…). The cross is not a de-divinization of God but the revelation of the divine God (…). God need not strip himself of his omnipotence in order to reveal his love. On the contrary, it requires omnipotence to be able to surrender oneself and give oneself away; and it requires omnipotence to be able to take oneself back in the giving and to preserve the independence and freedom of the recipient. Only an almighty love can give itself wholly to the other and be a helpless love": *The God of Jesus Christ*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: 1984), 194–195.

Bonaventure's Contribution

While Bonaventure's metaphysics of Christ the center falls within the logic of his Trinitarian theology, one may view his metaphysics as an ideological "Christian view of the world."[138] Bonaventure's intention in developing his metaphysics, however, was to correct certain ideas perpetrated by erroneous philosophies that rendered the search for truth fragmentary and dislocated. After all, if the totality of the triune God is revealed in Christ, the Word of God, then should not true knowledge be found in Christ, who is the incarnate Word, crucified, risen and glorified? For the divine influence of this Word of God extends to the entire universe and all peoples; no one is excluded from the divine Word or the influence of divine grace. Christ, the center is everywhere; it is not simply the individual existent, Jesus of Nazareth but Jesus (the incarnate One) who is now the Christ and hence the center of creation, the center by which the immanent and the economic Trinity coincide as the single extension of God's love to all others in history. Knowledge of *this* God means knowledge of the other, which can take place only through an experience of love.

Bonaventure's metaphysics is an integration of prayer and contemplation, death and transcendent union, knowledge and love. Because Christ crucified is the metaphysical center, Bonaventure indicates that knowledge of God cannot be rigidly formulated or imprisoned by our definitions; rather, God must be contemplated, because "God" is a Trinity of incomprehensible mystery who is more than we can conceive. The height of knowledge, therefore, never leads to power and control, but to self-surrender and sacrifice. Bonaventure's metaphysics stands against any form of self-glorification or arrogance; truth is not a matter of personal preference. His thought corresponds to the postmodern idea of knowledge as participation, but rebels against a type of relativism that collapses knowledge into isolated individualism. For Bonaventure, there is one truth grounded in the eternal Word of God, and he fears any search for truth apart from the Word. A shattering of the Word of God, in his view, would lead to the separation of faith and world, theology and philosophy,

[138] Heidegger, according to Louis Chauvet, claimed that "just as any thinking which would attempt to make itself a 'Christian philosophy' would be doomed, so any theology which would base itself on a philosophy would corrupt itself into an ideology of 'the Christian view of the world' ": see Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. Patrick Madigan and Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville: 1995), 64.

eternity and time. Rather, contemplation of the mystery of God ultimately transforms the one who desires to know God. Knowledge is transformative and performative, for the one who is transformed by God in Christ becomes, like Christ, a revealer of the depths of divine mystery.

Bonaventure points to a way of doing theology that opens the possibility of a fuller, richer expression of humanity. It is a way that "enhances our humanity through a continuously deepening knowledge of the world of God's creation and of ourselves in this world. He envisions a dialogue between the human spirit with its orientation toward union with the mystery of God's love and the human, worldly context in which human life must be lived out. He offers us a way of coming to understand faith and to translate faith into life."[139] His primary concern is that we use every form of knowledge in the right spirit and for the right purpose. That is, we must learn to join knowledge with charity. "Knowledge puffs up, charity builds up; thus, it is necessary to join knowledge with charity" (*scientia inflat, caritas aedificat; ideo oportet iungere cum scientia caritatem.*)[140] Hayes writes: "Knowledge is never an end in itself. It must always become a step toward ever deeper, richer love and transforming union with the God of love."[141] "Doing theology" therefore is self-implicating and shapes the theologian. Theology is a spiritual practice because it requires grace and a deepening of life in the Spirit. In the words of Philip Sheldrake: "To think *about* God is to think *of* God and therefore to become involved *with* God."[142]

In an age that longs for truth in the face of rapid scientific progress, Bonaventure's synthesis of speculation and charity, science and wisdom, intellectualism and mysticism grounded in Christ the center holds value. What will unite us as we seek to transcend the absolutizing of the finite and the relativism of life? What will prevent the total collapse of the earth from self-destruction in the face of secularization, materialism and apathy? Since Descartes' *Discourse on Method*, Western thought has been preoccupied with methods of analyses that separate out reason from the "stuff" of life. Bonaventure's method of mystical theology, the searching of the hidden depths of God, locates the context of knowledge within the context

---

139 Hayes, "Bonaventure of Bagnoregio," 54.

140 *De don. Spir.* 4.24 (5, 478).

141 Hayes, "Bonaventure of Bagnoregio," 56.

142 Philip Sheldrake, "Spirituality and Its Critical Methodology," in *Exploring Christian Spirituality: Essays in honor of Sandra M. Schneiders*, ed. Bruce Lescher and Elizabeth Liebert (New York: 2006), 25.

of everyday life, the fragile humanity that Christ assumed, the diversity of creation, and the dignity of the human person. His spiritual approach to theology impels us to search for truth in our world, not as ideological conviction but as that "something greater" within us which binds us together despite our differences. The integral relationship between Trinity, creation, and humanity, by which all things come from God (*emanatione*), reflect God (*exemplaritate*), and return to God (*reductio*), assumes a vivifying relationship in the life of the Spirit. The theologian is one who, filled with the Spirit, contemplates the depths of the mystery, the fountain fullness of God's love, and returns love for love. The integrating center of theology is Christ crucified, and one must die into love in order to know what is lasting and true. Thus, one must let go and let oneself be grasped by the God of overflowing love. Wisdom, according to Bonaventure, is knowing when to let go and to let love prevail. For it is in the letting go that God is revealed.

Conclusion

The unity of theology and spirituality in Bonaventure's thought may at first seem like a remarkable achievement of complex proportions, but it is the distilled vision of a mystic who had insight into the nature of God as love, and hence into the self-communication of that love in the person of Jesus Christ. If scripture is the source of theology, then revelation is the heart of Christian theology. For Bonaventure, God reveals himself not as a thought or an idea, but as the concrete person of Jesus Christ. While the simplicity of this idea is the basis of Christian belief, it spoke to Bonaventure of the nature of theology itself. If faith seeks understanding, then what is understood cannot be abstract or speculative, but must be personal. That is, true understanding or talk of God—theology—can come about only through relationship with the person of Jesus Christ, not through logical reason. In this respect, the person of Jesus Christ is the theological center and, as such, the personal nexus of theology and spirituality. Carpenter writes, "the very nature of revelation is an invitation to relationship with God."[143] To know God in Christ is to attain union in love.

For Bonaventure, knowledge and love are the means by which we attain to God.[144] The theologian is one who, enlightened by the gifts of

[143] Carpenter, *Theology as the Road*, 126.
[144] *Red. art.* 12 (5, 323).

the Holy Spirit, begins to comprehend what is accepted in faith. By integrating theology into the spiritual path of purgation, illumination, and union, Bonaventure explains how one like Francis, simple and unlettered, could become a theologian. Although one who seeks God must purge all that is not of God, theology is really a paradigm of the illuminative way.[145] Bonaventure teaches that theology, through the work of the gift of understanding, brings us to the "magnitude of admiration," which is the same as imperfect contemplation which, in turn, disposes one to the gifts of perfect contemplation and mystical union. Francis is the model of the true theologian because he attained true knowledge of God through ecstatic wisdom, signified by the stigmata. In light of Francis, Bonaventure indicates that the crucified Christ is the center of theology; all theology finds its end in the crucified Christ who is the wisdom of God. In this respect, the cross is not simply the last phase of Jesus' life, a conclusion to his story. Rather, the crucified Christ is the total expression of Trinitarian love; of God, no more can be said. Thus, one who arrives at the height of theology enters the mystery of God, which is dark, silent, and speechless. This is the highest stage of theology, because it is the stage of perfect wisdom. Francis attained this wisdom, according to Bonaventure, and became the *perscrutator* who contuited God in creation and hence brought the hidden God to light in the poor and humble things of creation. Francis was a true theologian, because the love of Christ deepened his search for God as he sought to find God in all things. Bonaventure indicates that intellectual knowledge alone does not make one a theologian; rather, the theologian is one whose spiritual life leads to wisdom, that is, knowledge of God deepened by love. In this respect, theology belongs to the mystics. A poor old woman with a deep love of God could be a better theologian than the most well-trained scholar.[146] Karl Rahner's insight into contemporary Christian life sheds light on Bonaventure's synthesis: "The theologian of the future will either be a mystic, one who has experienced something, or she will cease to be anything at all."[147] For doing

---

[145] *Trip. via* prol. 1 (8, 3): *Hic autem triplex intellectus respondet triplici actui hierarchico, scilicet purgationi, illuminationi et perfectioni.*

[146] One may note here the example of many women mystics and, in particular, the Franciscan third order penitent, Angela of Foligno, whose epithet reads "teacher of theologians." See Paul LaChance, *Angela of Foligno: Complete Works* (New York: 1993), 9 and 107.

[147] Karl Rahner, "Christian Living Formerly and Today" in *Further Theology of the Spiritual Life* I, trans. David Bourke (Theological Investigations) 7 (New York: 1971), 14f. See LaNave (*Through Holiness*, 8): "In this essay, Rahner warned that a mere 'rational attitude to the speculative problems of the divine' was not enough, that 'the devout Christian of

theology is first and foremost wholeheartedly living Christian life. It is "everyday mysticism" by which the seeker of God, through the grace and gifts of the Spirit, begins to realize that the whole creation is "charged with the grandeur of God."[148] The theologian is one who brings to light that which is hidden, because the theologian is one who has discovered the divine light first in him- or herself. Only one who is conformed to Christ, the true light, can see the light of God in creation. The nexus of spirituality and theology in Bonaventure's view means that theology is transformative. One who seeks God in Christ is transformed in Christ and thus becomes, like Francis, another Christ. The theologian, therefore, is not simply one who reveals God, but one in whom God is revealed.

---

the future will either be a mystic, one who has experienced something, or he will cease to be anything at all.' "

[148] Gerard Manley Hopkins, *A Hopkins Reader: Selections*, ed. John Pick (New York: 1966).

BONAVENTURE AS PREACHER

Timothy J. Johnson

Three activities defined a Parisian master of theology, according to Peter Cantor: reading (*legere*) or commenting on scriptural and theological texts, arguing (*disputare*) theological questions, and preaching (*predicare*).[1] Extant sermons ascribed to Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, who was well known for the first two scholastic duties, reveal that he also took this preaching responsibility to heart; indeed, they offer a compelling image of an eloquent preacher whose evangelical activity was widespread and deeply appreciated in thirteenth-century ecclesial circles. Thanks to the sustained editorial efforts of Jacques Bougerol and others, more than three hundred and eighty authentic sermons from Bonaventure[2] are available in the respective critical editions of the *Seasonal Sermons*,[3] *Diverse Sermons*,[4] and the *Sunday Sermons*.[5] In addition to this wealth of texts, there are also three series of university sermons, the *Collations on the Ten Commandments*,[6]

---

[1] "In tribus autem consistit exercitium sacrae Scripturae: in lectione, disputatione, predicatione." Peter Cantor, *Verbum Abbreviatum*, ed. Monique Boutry (Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio medievalis) 196 (Turnhout: 2004), c. 1, n. 1, 9. If one is to believe the Migne version of the *Verbum Abbreviatum*, the most important of these three activities was preaching, because reading and disputing are subordinate to it, "Praedicatio vero, cui subserviunt priora, quasi tectum est tegens fideles ab aestu et a turbine vitiorum," (Patrologia Latina, ed. Jacques Paul Migne) 205 (Paris: 1855), col. 25. On preaching in the thirteenth century and throughout the Middle Ages, see *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Kienzle (Turnhout: 2000). With regard to Franciscan preaching, see *Franciscans and Preaching: Every Miracle from the Beginning of the World Came about through Words*, ed. Timothy J. Johnson (Leiden: Brill, 2012). I would like to thank Flagler College in Saint Augustine, Florida, and the Centre for the Comparative Study of Religious Life at the Katholische Universität in Eichstätt, Germany, for providing the resources to complete this essay.

[2] Nicole Bériou, *L'avènement des maîtres de la Parole: La prédication à Paris au XIII^e siècle*, vol. 1 (Paris: 1998), 105. Sections 1, 2, and 5 draw from the introduction in Bonaventure, *Sunday Sermons*, ed. and trans. Timothy J. Johnson (Saint Bonaventure: 2008).

[3] *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermons de tempore*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Paris: 1990). Henceforth *SDT*.

[4] *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermons de diversis*, 2 vols., ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Paris: 1993). Henceforth *SDD 1* and *SDD 2* respectively.

[5] *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones dominicales*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Grottaferrata: 1977). Henceforth *SDM*.

[6] *Collationes de decem praeceptis* (5, 507a–532b) in *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae opera omnia*, 10 vols. (Quaracchi: 1882–1902). Henceforth *De dec. praec*. References to the writings of Bonaventure, unless noted otherwise, come from this Quaracchi edition and give volume and page numbers in parentheses.

the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*,[7] and the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*,[8] which provide additional examples of Bonaventure's homiletic expertise.[9]

This abundance of homiletic material bears witness to the keen interest Bonaventure's confreres took in the preaching of their fellow Minorite. For example, Peter Olivi, who heard the minister general in Paris,[10] and Salimbene de Adam, who was present in Bologna when Bonaventure addressed the brothers,[11] recount specific details of his preaching. According to Salimbene, it was Mark of Montefaltro in particular who was responsible for preserving so many of Bonaventure's sermons, even as he feigned disregard:

> Also, whenever Brother Bonaventure, the Minister General, had to preach to the clergy, Brother Mark would go to him and say to him, "You are merely a hired servant, and at another time, when you preached, you didn't even know what you were saying, and I hope you will do the same now." Brother Mark said this, however, to provoke him to speak better, in accord with what is written in Ecclesiasticus 22:24: *He that pricks the eye, brings out tears, and he that pricks the heart, brings forth understanding*. Nevertheless Brother Mark wrote down all of Brother Bonaventure's sermons and wished to have them.[12]

This essay studies Bonaventure's sermons by first contextualizing his preaching in thirteenth-century Paris against the backdrop of the early Franciscan movement, and then examines the contents and style of the *Seasonal Sermons*, the *Diverse Sermons*, and the *Sunday Sermons*. The final section considers the three university sermon series, the *Collations on the Ten Commandments*, the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, and the *Collation on the Six Days of Creation*.

---

[7] *Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti* (5, 457a–503b). Henceforth *De don. Spir.*

[8] *Collationes in hexaëmeron*, (5, 329a–449b). Henceforth *Hex*.

[9] Nicole Bériou, *L'avènement*, vol. 1, 105.

[10] Petrus Iohannis Olivi, *Lectura super apocalysim* in Warren Lewis, *Peter John Olivi: Prophet of the Year 2000* (Ph. D. diss., Tübingen: 1972), 392–394.

[11] Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica II*, ed. G. Scalia (CCCM) 125A (Turnhout: 1998), 865.

[12] "Item, quando frater Bonaventura, generalis, clero predicare debebat, ibat eum frater Marcus et sibi dicebat: 'Tu es quidam mercenarius, et alia vice, quando predicasti, nescivisti quid diceres. Sic spero quod facies modo.' Hoc autem frater Marcus dicebat, ut eum ad melius dicendum provocaret, iuxta verbum quod scriptum est, Eccli. XXII: *Pungens oculum deducit lacrimas, et qui pungit cor profert sensum*. Et tamen frater Marcus omnes sermones fratris Bonaventure scribebat et habere volebat": Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica I*, ed. G. Scalia (CCCM) 125 (Turnhout: 1998), 471.

Franciscan Ministry and Institutional Preaching

When comparing the preaching of Francis of Assisi with the *Seasonal Sermons*, Jacques Bougerol notes that there is nothing in common between the style of the Poverello and that of Bonaventure.[13] The same claim regarding style holds true for the entirety of his sermon production. Early accounts of Francis offer an image of a preacher without a formal sermon style, whose words and gestures seemed to fuse into a compelling exhortation to repentance and praise.[14] Thomas of Spalato, a youthful eyewitness to Francis' preaching in the public piazza of Bologna in 1222, claimed Francis spoke like one addressing a public assembly, as he urged those gathered to forsake violence and to work for civil peace.[15] While similar concerns are found in Bonaventure's preaching, the text of the *Seasonal Sermons*, like that of the *Diverse Sermons* and *Sunday Sermons*, represents the *sermo modernus* style, which witnessed a growing popularity in Paris and elsewhere.[16] This innovative style of clerical preaching appeared at the close of the twelfth century; it developed a thematic approach to a specific scripture text and supplanted the earlier patristic-monastic technique of verse commentary.[17] Numerous authors of the period offered *artes praedicandi* to ensure the proper formulation of this emerging literary genre,[18] which was remarkably suited to both clerical and lay audiences.[19]

The structure of the *sermo modernus* included the theme, the protheme, the initial prayer, and the subdivision of the theme.[20] After announcing the theme, a protheme invited the audience to prayer. The preacher then returned to the theme and stated how he would develop his thoughts.

---

[13] Bougerol, *SDT*, 25.

[14] Helmut Feld, *Franziskus von Assisi und seine Bewegung* (Darmstadt: 1996), 199–202.

[15] *Testimonia minora saeculi xiii*, ed. Leonardus Lemmens (Florence: 1926), 10.

[16] For an extended treatment of this novel sermon style, which Nicole Bériou calls the "nouvelle art de prêcher," see Nicole Bériou, *L'avènement*, vol. 1, 133–214.

[17] M. Michèle Mulcahey, "*First the Bow is Bent in Study. . . .*" *Dominican Education before 1350* (Toronto: 1998), 401–419.

[18] Nicole Bériou, "Les sermons latins après 1200" in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Kienzle, 370. Bériou mentions the date of 1210 in *L'avènement*, vol. 1, 259.

[19] D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford: 1985), 193.

[20] Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Bonaventure* (Tournai: 1961), 192. Many manuscripts indicate that the *Sermo modernus* often concluded with an intercessory prayer, or preconium; see Nicole Bériou, *L'avènement*, vol. 1, 274–279. Although all the Sunday Sermons end with an intercessory prayer, none of them contains the full prayer. An intriguing example of Bonaventure's use of the preconium is found in *Sermon 45 (1) On Saint Mark Evangelist*, in *SDD* 2, 593.

Bonaventure's predilection is obvious in his frequent threefold thematic division, whereas other mendicant preachers like Thomas Aquinas and Jean de la Rochelle preferred a fourfold structure.[21] In his sermons, Bonaventure frequently separates each of the three subsections or primary members into three secondary members.[22] His task, like others who employed the *sermo modernus*, required him to elaborate on the scriptural theme through a *dilatatio*, that is, a careful development of the previously announced individual members.[23] As D.L. d'Avray indicates, this methodology fosters a matrix of ideas that spread out from the original scripture text.[24] The very first sermon of the *Sunday Sermons, On Advent*, demonstrates this pattern:

Theme: *The one desired by the nations will come*. Haggai 2:8
Protheme: *There is a time and opportunity for each affair*. Wisdom 8:6
Prayer: At the outset of our words, let us, most beloved, first call upon the Father (…).
Subdivision of Theme: *The one desired by the nations will come*. Haggai 2:8
  First: As the most gracious mediator
  Second: As the most truthful doctor
  Third: As the most humble king
First Primary: [he] *will come*
  First Secondary: To display the remedies of peace and harmony
  Second Secondary: To offer proofs of piety and justice
  Third Secondary: To demonstrate examples of humility and indigence
Second Primary: *the one desired*
  First Secondary: Because of the splendor of original innocence
  Second Secondary: Because of the preciousness of illuminating grace
  Third Secondary: Because of the pleasure of soothing wisdom
Third Primary: *all the nations*
  First Secondary: Because the original fault was deleted
  Second Secondary: Because the just judgment was relaxed
  Third Secondary: Because the nations sought the sublimity of final glory[25]

---

[21] Bougerol, *SDT*, 30.
[22] There are exceptions to this treatment of the theme in the *Sunday Sermons*. *Sermo 6* has four primary members accompanied by three secondary members. *Sermo 31* and *Sermo 37* have only two primary members, which are developed further by three secondary members.
[23] On this methodology, see Mulcahey, "*First the Bow*," 407–414.
[24] d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 246.
[25] *Sermo 1, SDM*, 131–138.

The introduction of the *sermo modernus* model coincided in Paris with an expanding ecclesial commitment to pastoral care initiated by, among others, Peter Cantor, on the cusp of the thirteenth century.[26] The rapid growth and subsequent clericalization of the Minorites necessitated a sermon style commensurate with their ecclesial ministry. Far removed from the early penitential preaching style and form of life revealed in the *Earlier Rule* of 1221, the brothers in Paris and other urban centers integrated papal directives, such as Gregory IX's *Quoniam abundavit iniquitatis* of 1237, into their formation theory and practice. Sermon construction, given the requisite dogmatic content, now belonged by rights to ordained brothers alone, who were entrusted to contest heresy and drive out vice through the good news of God's word.[27] Since a theological education was intrinsic to this manner of ministry, it is not surprising that, perhaps as early as 1243, Innocent IV forbade the laity in *Noverit universitas vestra* from the office of preaching.[28] Although their pastoral preaching evidenced distinctive characteristics,[29] Minorite clerics, like their counterparts in the Order of Preachers, dedicated their intellectual efforts to the demanding task of sermon preparation in the *studia* throughout the Order.[30] Preaching within this academic environment served as an integral component of pastoral preparation.[31] Legislation within the Franciscan Order on the constitutional level, which only comes into view after the contentious

[26] On the renewal in preaching that preceded the Minorite arrival at the University of Paris, see Jörg Oberste, "Predigt und Gesellschaft um 1200: Praktische Moraltheologie und pastorale Neuorientierung im Umfeld der Pariser Universität am Vorabend der Mendikanten," in *Die Bettelorden im Aufbau: Beiträge zu Institutionalisierungsprozessen im mittelalterlichen Religiosentum*, ed. Gert Melville and Jörg Oberste (Münster: 1999), 245–295.

[27] Oberste, "Predigt und Gesellschaft," 292–294. While the *Later Rule* reflects dimensions of the early preaching style of the brothers, there is no doubt that it represents a view removed from that first proposed and practiced by Francis. On this point, see Servus Gieben, "Preaching in the Franciscan Order (Thirteenth Century)," in *Monks, Nuns, and Friars in Medieval Society* (Swanee: 1989), 9–12. An English translation of *Quoniam abundavit iniquitatis* is available in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*, vol. 1: *The Saint*, ed. Regis Armstrong, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, and William Short (New York: 1999), 575–577.

[28] Lawrence Landini, *The Causes of the Clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor* (Chicago: 1968), 68–69.

[29] On some of the possible differences between the preaching of the Order of Preachers and the Minors, see Carla Casagrande, in *Prediche alle donne del secolo XII: Testi di Umberto da Romans, Gilberto da Tournai, Stefano di Borbone*, ed. Carla Casagrande (Milano, 1978), xvi–xxi. On the danger of drawing distinctions between the Minorites and Preachers after the thirteenth century, see Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (Cambridge: 2005), p. 293.

[30] Jacques Bougerol, "Le origini e la finalità dello studio nell'ordine francescano," *Antonianum* 53 (1978): 405–422.

[31] Jacques Bougerol, "Les sermons dans les 'studia' des mendiants," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti* (Todi: 1978), 251–280.

General Chapter of 1238, evinces an effort to coordinate the preaching office with papal directives and academic policies. This insistence on intellectual development within the Order and the Church is exemplified by John of Parma, who preceded Bonaventure as Minister General in 1247. Not only did John claim that study was an indispensable wall for the edifice of the Minorite Order, according to Thomas of Eccleston,[32] but he also did not hesitate to brusquely scold Salimbene when he thought the young brother might attempt to escape from a rigorous examination before receiving the office of preacher.[33]

Minorite efforts to foster preaching through solid academic preparation and administrative directives, while understandable given the institutional concerns of the Church, required a theoretical justification that was internally coherent to the brothers, and externally comprehensible—albeit controversial—to friends and foes alike. Despite the popularity of the *sermo modernus* among educated Franciscans, the presupposed academic preparation fostered an educational system that another Minorite, Roger Bacon, criticized as antithetical to authentic preaching, since it ignored the study of biblical languages and eschewed experience.[34] Bonaventure offers a preemptive *apologia* in the *Letter in Response to Three Questions of an Unknown Master* from 1254–1255, when he appeals to the experience of the church to propose a hermeneutical of institutional accommodation; that is to say, the validity of the Minorite Order within the ecclesial structure is verifiable, inasmuch as it conforms to the institutional pattern of the Church itself.[35] This interpretive stance permits him to simultaneously affirm the historical roots of the Minorite Order in the experience of Francis and to confirm the contemporary reality of the convents in Paris and elsewhere. Nowhere is this more apparent than when he responds to a question that is not tangential to preaching: study. The unknown master raised an issue when he noted the stark contrast between early companions of Francis and those who later entered the order. According to

---

[32] *Fratris Thomae vulgo dictu de Eccleston Tractatus de adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. G. Little (Manchester: 1951), 74.

[33] Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica I*, 455.

[34] Roger Bacon, *Compendium Studii Philosophiae* in *Opera quaedam hactenus inedita*, ed. J.S. Brewer (London: 1859), 425–437. On Roger Bacon and preaching, see "Roger Bacon's Critique of Franciscan Preaching," in *Institution und Charisma: Festschrift für Gert Melville*, eds. Franz J. Felten, Annette Kehnel, Stefan Weinfurter (Vienna: 2009), 541–548, and idem, "Preaching Precedes Theology: Roger Bacon's Critique of Mendicant Education," *Franciscan Studies* 68 (2010): 83–95.

[35] *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus*, n. 13 (8, 336a–b).

the *Later Rule* of 1223, those who are illiterate should not desire learning, but now, according to the master, even laymen who gave little thought to philosophical reasoning, eagerly read, write, refute, and elaborate doctrinal teachings.[36] Bonaventure does not dispute the claim, but utilizes it rather as the foundational justification of the Franciscan evangelical endeavor. Just as the Church began with simple and uneducated fishermen and grew to include illustrious and learned doctors, so too, does the order contain many doctors. Given that one discerns the workings of Christ in this unceasing growth of the church through the centuries, it is readily apparent that God authenticates the Minorite order through the same institutional dynamic. Bonaventure candidly confesses that this reading of ecclesiastical history drew him to lovingly embrace Francis's way of life. The undeniable consequence of this hermeneutic is the affirmation that books and anything else essential to Franciscan ministry are an integral aspect of their ecclesial identity as preachers:

> Listen to what I know in regard to *books* and other *useful tools*. The Rule expressly declares that the authority and office of preaching is assigned to the brothers, which I do not believe is found in any other Rule. If they are not obliged to preach fables but the divine word; and they are unable to understand, unless they read; and they are unable to read, unless they have written material: then it is entirely clear that having books, like preaching, is proper to the perfection of the Rule.[37]

This defense of preaching as a legitimate activity of the Order while at the University of Paris underscores Bonaventure's commitment to an essential aspect of the Minorite vocation, yet it is within the period of his generalate that he labored most extensively to educate his confreres concerning the ministerial mandate entrusted to them by the Church. Throughout his ministry, Bonaventure consciously grounded his pedagogy on the foundation of words and deeds. Not only did he remind the brothers of the necessity and the manner of evangelical preaching in his writing; he also endeavored to offer them a living example of a preacher in their midst through his extensive travels.

---

[36] *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus*, n. 1 (8, 331b). For the text from the *Later Rule of 1223*, see *Regula Bullata*, c. 10 in Kajetan Esser, *Die Opuscula des hl. Franziskus von Assisi* (Grottaferrata: 1976), 370.

[37] "De *libris* et *utensilibus* quid sentiam, audi. Clamat Regula expresse imponens Fratribus auctoritatem et officium praedicandi, quod non credo in aliqua Regula alia reperiri. Si igitur praedicare non debent fabulas, sed verba divina; et haec scire non possunt, nisi legant; nec legere, nisi habeant scripta: planissimum est, quod de perfectione Regulae est libros habere sicut et predicare." *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus*, n. 6 (8, 332b–333a).

The Seasonal Sermons

The critical edition of the *Sermones de tempore*, or *Seasonal Sermons*, is due in no small part to the devotion of Bonaventure's secretary, Mark of Montefeltro. Salimbene claimed that Mark "wrote down all of Brother Bonaventure's sermons and wanted to have them,"[38] but there is no extant manuscript. One of the most prominent sermon manuscripts, Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, cod. A. 11 sup. (Mi) appears, however, to be a copy of Mark's now lost original collection. Discovered in 1872 by Fedele da Fanna, it contains 295 sermon schemas from the thirteenth century, 269 of which are attributed to Bonaventure, and it was published in a critical edition as the *Seasonal Sermons*. A noteworthy feature of this crucial manuscript is that rubrics accompany 258 sermons, thus allowing scholars to situate Bonaventure's ministerial activity within a specific ecclesial and liturgical context. Another important manuscript Fanna uncovered is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 14595 (Pa), which is also dated to the thirteenth century. The Italian copyist states his intention in this document to compile material from Bonaventure together with that of other ministers and preachers, but refrains from including rubrics for the 321 sermons. Before he discovered Pa, Fanna believed that the enormous collection from Milan came directly from the hand of Mark of Montefeltro; however, the Parisian manuscript was remarkably similar yet clearly distinct from Mi. As Bougerol notes, Fanna was forced to conclude that both Mi and Pa represented the labors of Italian scribes, who worked independently of each other.[39] This scribal activity provided a firm foundation for the critical edition of the *Season Sermons*, published in 1990.

The *Seasonal Sermons* provide a wide-ranging panoramic view of Bonaventure's preaching activity among the religious, clergy, and royalty of his day. What they lack in depth—given their abbreviated schematic structure—they make up for in geographical and chronological breadth. Bougerol dates the earliest sermon, *Sermo 27*, to 7 December 1253, when Bonaventure addressed the Parisian university community at Saint Jacques.[40] This convent of the Dominicans or Order of Preachers, as well as those in Lyon, Montpellier, Viterbo, Arras, Milan, and Bologna, often welcomed Bonaventure through the years, as the rubrics of some

[38] See note 12.
[39] Bougerol, *SDD 1*, 10.
[40] *Sermo 27*, *SDT*, 79–80.

27 sermons reveal.[41] The thematic varied, with appeals to Aristotle in the protheme of *Sermo 67*, reflections on human temperaments and leprosy in *Sermo 262*, and an explanation of what it means to be brothers and sisters of Christ in *Sermo 197*.[42] Monastic orders with foundations in Paris such as the Benedictines at Saint-Denis[43] and the Cistercians at Saint Anthony[44] heard Bonaventure, as did the Benedictines at Cluny.[45] While in Assisi, Bonaventure preached twice to the Poor Clares in the new church dedicated to their patroness,[46] once to the sisters in Genoa,[47] and at least once to the Poor Clare community at Longchamp,[48] which was founded by Isabelle of France, who, together with her brother Louis IX, was dedicated to the followers of the Poverello. Themes of humility, penance, and contemplation come to the fore when he is among the sisters, and reflect the vocational insights he offered to Isabelle's foundation at Longchamp in the treatise *On the Perfection of Religious Life*.[49] Isabelle, together with members of the royal family, often had the opportunity to hear Bonaventure preach. The *Seasonal Sermons* include many held in the presence of the king of France and his court.[50] Of particular note are the treatment of martyrdom and the obstinacy of unbelievers in *Sermo 9*, in view of Louis IX's imprisonment during the Seventh Crusade and his subsequent

---

[41] For the sermons in Paris, see *Sermo 3, SDT*, 47–50; *Sermo 12, SDT*, 65–67; *Sermo 15, SDT*, 71; *Sermo 20, SDT*, 73–75; *Sermo 27, SDT*, 79–80; *Sermo 64, SDT*, 114–116; *Sermo 96, SDT*, 154–155; *Sermo 116, SDT*, 177–178; *Sermo 157, SDT*, 223–225; *Sermo 175, SDT*, 42–244; *Sermo 216, SDT*, 296–298; *Sermo 226, SDT*, 310–311; *Sermo 255, SDT*, 348–349; *Sermo 262, SDT*, 357–359; *Sermo 278, SDT*, 379–381; *Sermo 285, SDT*, 387–389; and *Sermo 291, SDT*, 396–397. For the sermons in Lyon, see *Sermo 43, SDT*, 94–95; *Sermo 63, SDT*, 113–114; *Sermo 137, SDT*, 200–201; *Sermo 173, SDT*, 240–241 and *Sermo 197, SDT*, 269–270. For the sermons in Montpellier, Viterbo, Arras, Milan and Bologna, see *Sermo 6, SDT*, 53–55; *Sermo 67, SDT*, 119–120; *Sermo 250, SDT*, 343–344; *Sermo 252, SDT*, 344–345 and Bologna, *Sermo 267, SDT*, 365–366 respectively.

[42] Bougerol, *SDT*, 33.

[43] *Sermo 16, SDT*, 72–73 and *Sermo 84, SDT*, 139.

[44] *Sermo 196, SDT*, 268–269.

[45] *Sermo 185, SDT*, 251–253.

[46] *Sermo 54, SDT*, 103–104 and *Sermo 106, SDT*, 164–165.

[47] *Sermo 244, SDT*, 338.

[48] *Sermo 200, SDT*, 274–275 and perhaps *Sermo 171, SDT*, 238–239.

[49] *De perfectione vitae ad sorores* (8, 107a–127b).

[50] *Sermo 1, SDT*, 45–46; *Sermo 2, SDT*, 46–47; *Sermo 8, SDT*, 58–59; *Sermo 9, SDT*, 59–61; *Sermo 40, SDT*, 93; *Sermo 53, SDT*, 102–103; *Sermo 57, SDT*, 106–107; *Sermo 58, SDT*, 108; *Sermo 66, SDT*, 118–119; *Sermo 79, SDT*, 132–133; *Sermo 80, SDT*, 133–134; *Sermo 86, SDT*, 141–142; *Sermo 89, SDT*, 146–147; *Sermo 91, SDT*, 150–151; *Sermo 97, SDT*, 155–156; *Sermo 101, SDT*, 159–160; *Sermo 121, SDT*, 182–183; *Sermo 146, SDT*, 211–212; *Sermo 156, SDT*, 222–223; *Sermo 165, SDT*, 233–234; *Sermo 176, SDT*, 244; *Sermo 198, SDT*, 270–273; *Sermo 199, SDT*, 273–274; *Sermo 204, SDT*, 280–281; *Sermo 217, SDT*, 298–299; *Sermo 219, SDT*, 300–301; and *Sermo 222, SDT*, 304–305.

death at the outset of the Eighth Crusade.[51] Not surprisingly, various sermons were delivered in the presence of local and regional clerics,[52] others to the papal curia,[53] to university gatherings,[54] and to the public.[55] Time and time again, these texts underscore the level of culture and learning proper to the audience who heard him outside the walls of his Minorite convents.[56]

Fellow Franciscans constitute the largest audience for Bonaventure and their wide-spread convents and churches are the preferred locus for proclaiming the Scriptures. The last extant sermon, *Sermo 207*, is from 11 March 1274 in Lyon.[57] No longer minister general, but now cardinal of Albano, he preaches to his confreres on the cusp of the Second Council of Lyon on Eph. 1:5,8: *May you walk as sons of light*. The peripatetic nature of this text is emblematic of Bonaventure's pastoral commitment to his brothers, as he often traveled on foot to visit convents as near as Paris and as distant as Rome, to encourage them.[58] Indeed, the *Seasonal Sermons* include numerous sermons delivered specifically to his conferes gathered in conventual chapters, including twenty with the notation *de mane*.[59]

---

[51] *Sermo 9, SDT*, 59–61; see also Bougerol, *SDT*, 32. On Bonaventure's preaching to Louis IX, see Jacques Guy Bougerol, "Saint Bonaventure et le roi saint Louis," in *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974*, vol. 2, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Grottaferrata: 1974), 469–493.

[52] *Sermo 10, SDT*, 61–63; *Sermo 31, SDT*, 83–87; *Sermo 50, SDT*, 101–102; *Sermo 72, SDT*, 126–127; *Sermo 83, SDT*, 137–138; and *Sermo 95, SDT*, 153–154.

[53] *Sermo 11, SDT*, 63–64; *Sermo 43, SDT*, 94–95; *Sermo 46, SDT*, 97–99; *Sermo 65, SDT*, 116–117; *Sermo 70, SDT*, 123–125; *Sermo 71, SDT*, 125–126; and *Sermo 122, SDT*, 183–184.

[54] *Sermo 3, SDT*, 47–50; *Sermo 5, SDT*, 52–53; *Sermo 12, SDT*, 65–67; *Sermo 13, SDT*, 68–69; *Sermo 20, SDT*, 73–75; *Sermo 27, SDT*, 79–80; *Sermo 37, SDT*, 90–91; *Sermo 88, SDT*, 133–134; *Sermo 90, SDT*, 147–150; *Sermo 96, SDT*, 154–155; *Sermo 99, SDT*, 157–158; *Sermo 107, SDT*, 165–166; *Sermo 108, SDT*, 166–168; *Sermo 109, SDT*, 168–169; *Sermo 115, SDT*, 176–177; *Sermo 116, SDT*, 177–178; *Sermo 128, SDT*, 191–192; *Sermo 155, SDT*, 219–222; *Sermo 157, SDT*, 223–225; *Sermo 158, SDT*, 225–227; *Sermo 175, SDT*, 242–244; *Sermo 201, SDT*, 276–277; *Sermo 216, SDT*, 296–298; *Sermo 226, SDT*, 310–311; *Sermo 231, SDT*, 316–318; *Sermo 233, SDT*, 319–321; *Sermo 278, SDT*, 379–381; *Sermo 285, SDT*, 387–389; and *Sermo 291, SDT*, 396–397.

[55] *Sermo 7, SDT*, 55–57; *Sermo 31, SDT*, 83–87; *Sermo 50, SDT*, 101–102; *Sermo 56, SDT*, 104–105; *Sermo 65, SDT*, 116–117; *Sermo 92, SDT*, 51; *Sermo 93, SDT*, 152; *Sermo 95, SDT*, 153–154; *Sermo 103, SDT*, 161–163; *Sermo 105, SDT*, 163–164; *Sermo 119, SDT*, 180–181; *Sermo 120, SDT*, 181–182; *Sermo 142, SDT*, 205–207; *Sermo 180, SDT*, 248; *Sermo 215, SDT*, 295–296; *Sermo 224, SDT*, 307–308; *Sermo 245, SDT*, 338–340; and *Sermo 272, SDT*, 371–373.

[56] Bougerol, *SDT*, 34.

[57] *Sermo 207, SDT*, 284.

[58] Bougerol, *SDT*, 23. For a study of Bonaventure's specific preaching agenda and chronology in the south of France, see Jacques Paul, "La prédication de Saint Bonaventure dans le Midi," in *La prédication en Pays d'Oc (XII^e–début XV^e siècle)* (Cahiers de Fanjeaux) 32 (Toulouse: 1997), 127–157.

[59] *Sermo 36, SDT*, 87–89; *Sermo 39, SDT*, 92, *Sermo 45, SDT*, 95–97; *Sermo 57, SDT*, 106–107; *Sermo 62, SDT*, 112–113; *Sermo 74, SDT*, 128–129; *Sermo 81, SDT*, 134–136; *Sermo 82, SDT*,

As Bougerol indicates, this inherently meditative setting during the morning hours after matins or prime stands in stark contrast to that of Bonaventure's public sermons before the university, papal curia and royal court; thus, these sermon texts are particularly indicative of the spiritual directives that the professor, then general minister and cardinal wished to impart throughout the years to those gathered in this familial context.[60] Weaving together pastoral concerns with theological principles, the Seraphic Doctor endeavored to ground the evangelical and historical imperative of the Minorites in biblical exegesis and ecclesial doctrine. For example, the biblical and theological theme of light, which marked his reflection in *Sermo 207* as late as 1274, already appeared in the mid-1250s in *Sermo 36* and *Sermo 259*, when he addressed his brothers *de mane* in their Parisian chapter. Bonaventure commences *Sermo 36* by evoking the image of Christ as the light of all knowledge who has taken on flesh, and he prays that those gathered may be illuminated by the Lord.[61] Commenting on John's Gospel in *Sermo 259*, Bonaventure notes that the eternal generation of the Son from the Father, Christ's entrance into the world as the light of all knowledge in the incarnation, and his subsequent return or *reductio* to the Father in the ascension, is intelligible in terms of a circle, whereby a person is led back to the beginning. To follow Christ back to the Father is to enter into the *reductio* by imitating the Lord's example of leaving the world. This effort requires the relinquishing of possessions, pleasures and practices that impede religious life; and this relinquishing opens up the path of peace, light, and praise.[62]

136–137; *Sermo 186, SDT*, 253–255; *Sermo 205, SDT*, 281–282; *Sermo 212, SDT*, 291–292; *Sermo 221, SDT*, 303–304; *Sermo 230, SDT*, 315–316; *Sermo 246, SDT*, 340–341; *Sermo 247, SDT*, 341; *Sermo 248, SDT*, 341–342; *Sermo 258, SDT*, 351–352; *Sermo 259, SDT*, 353–354; *Sermo 261, SDT*, 356–357, and *Sermo 286, SDT*, 389–391. Other sermons in *capitulo* are *Sermo 6, SDT*, 53–55; *Sermo 14, SDT*, 69–70; *Sermo 15, SDT*, 71; *SDT*, *Sermo 25, SDT*, 78; *Sermo 30, SDT*, 81–82; *Sermo 48, SDT*, 100–101; *Sermo 56, SDT*, 104–105; *Sermo 63, SDT*, 113–114; *Sermo 67, SDT*, 119–120; *Sermo 136, SDT*, 200; *Sermo 153, SDT*, 217–218; *Sermo 154, SDT*, 218–219; *Sermo 161, SDT*, 229–230; *Sermo 174, SDT*, 241; *Sermo 181, SDT*, 248–249; *Sermo 210, SDT,* 289; *Sermo 213, SDT*, 292–293; *Sermo 227, SDT*, 312; *Sermo 228, SDT,* 313*; Sermo 229, SDT,* 314–315; *Sermo 232, SDT*, 319; *Sermo 235, SDT*, 323–324; *Sermo 242, SDT*, 335–336; *Sermo 251, SDT*, 344; *Sermo 273, SDT*, 373–375; *Sermo 274, SDT*, 375–376; *Sermo 280, SDT*, 382–383; *Sermo 283, SDT*, 384–386; *Sermo 284, SDT*, 387; *Sermo 287, SDT*, 391–392; *Sermo 288, SDT*, 393; *Sermo 289, SDT*, 394, and *Sermo 292, SDT*, 3 97–398. It should be noted that *Sermo 210, Sermo 228* and *Sermo 229* were given in provincial chapters of the Minorites, *Sermo 6* and *Sermo 63* in local chapters of the Preachers.

[60] Bougerol, *SDT*, 28–29, esp. n. 40.

[61] *Sermo 36, SDT*, 88.

[62] *Sermo 230, SDT*, 315.

The Diverse Sermons

Jacques Bougerol's work on editing the sermons *de tempore* and *de sanctis* in vol. 9 of the *Opera Omnia* culminated in a two-volume critical edition of the *Diverse Sermons*, published in 1993, and completed the triptych initiated by the *Sunday Sermons* and *Seasonal Sermons*.[63] Scholars such as Bougerol, Ignatius Brady,[64] Jacques Bataillon[65] and others had long recognized that the prodigious labor of Fedele da Fanna, who scoured the libraries of Europe in search of sermon manuscripts, and the Quaracchi editors who utilized his material, required a comprehensive re-evaluation in light of subsequent research. Bougerol took up the challenge by listing the authentic sermons of Bonaventure among those collected for the *Opera Omnia* through an examination of manuscript rubrics. In the process, numerous sermons once considered genuine were deemed doubtful, or were attributed to other authors. Other unedited sermons, previously unknown or overlooked, were examined as well. Benefiting thus from scholarship and extant manuscripts, 61 of which are listed in the introduction to the *Diverse Sermons*, Bougerol succeeded in establishing a critical text of 62 sermons, which he admitted was by no means definitive.[66] Ten of these sermons are also represented in the manuscript that Fedele da Fana discovered in Milan (Mi), and a comparison between the schemas of Mi and their counterparts in the *Diverse Sermons* demonstrates the singular role Mi plays in assuring both the authenticity and the geography of Bonaventure's pastoral ministry. A case in point is *Sermo 4* on Lk. 2:10–11.[67] This appears twice as a *reportatio* in the *Diverse Sermons* and is attributed to Bonaventure by the rubric of Mi, which states that this nativity address was delivered to the people of Assisi in the Church of St Clare.[68]

While the Mi schemas are invaluable for establishing the contours of Bonaventure's pastoral chronology, the *Diverse Sermons* foster a profound appreciation of his passionate involvement with the scriptures throughout the liturgical year. Nowhere is this more evident than in sermons on the Nativity of the Lord, where he marvels at the admirable sacrament

---

[63] Bougerol, *SDD 1*, 3–5.

[64] Ignatius Brady, "The *Opera Omnia* of Saint Bonaventure Revisited," in *Proceedings of the Seventh Centenary Celebration of the Death of Saint Bonaventure*, ed. Pascal Foley (Saint Bonaventure: 1975), 54.

[65] Jacques Bataillon, "Sur quelques sermons de saint Bonaventure," in *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974*, 496.

[66] Bougerol, *SDD 1*, 16.

[67] *Sermo 4*, *SDD 1*, 110–118.

[68] *Sermo 105*, *SDT*, 163.

of the Incarnation.[69] The Seraphic Doctor demonstrates the grounds for the coming celebration in *Sermo 1* by appealing to Song of Songs 8:1, *Who will give you to me for my brother, sucking on the breast of my mother, so I may find you outside and kiss you and no one will despise me*. Indeed, as he points out to his fellow religious, the logic of the Incarnation is to be uncovered in the longing of these lovers:

> The proposed text describes, in an orderly manner, the desire of the devout soul longing for the approaching birth of Christ. The order and reason of this desire is as follows: the rational soul, when created, was inscribed with the image of God and positioned before all visible creation. Everything was subject to humankind according to Genesis 1:26: *Let us make humankind in our image and likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea.* Men and women lost this excellence when they sinned; nevertheless, the longing for sublimity and excellence remained in them. Illuminated by the light of faith, they saw that they would not be restored to their pristine excellence unless the Son of God humbled himself to the degree that they had exalted themselves. Humanity believed that this would come to pass in the future and they began to love him passionately. Since the lover desires to be joined with the beloved, humankind desired the grace of union. A lover is unable to unite in a satisfying manner with a hidden or absent loved one; therefore, humankind desired him to be visible and present.[70]

The visible presence of the beloved, understood as the nativity of the Lord, allows humanity to draw close and enter into union with him, body and soul, through the contemplation of his humanity and divinity.[71] The salvific consequence of this dynamic of desire is revealed in the restoration of pristine excellence, and the joy found in the divine embrace.[72] *Sermo 2* elaborates on the importance of such longing by delineating the literal and allegorical meaning of the shepherds' resolution found in Lk. 2:15, *Let us go over to Bethlehem and let us see this word that is come to pass, which the*

---

[69] *Sermo 3, SDD 1*, 98.

[70] "In verbo proposito desiderium animae devotae desiderantis nativitatem Christi in proximo futuram describitur ordinate. Ordo autem et ratio huius desiderii talis fuit: anima rationalis, cum creata est, Dei imagine est insignita et cunctis visibilibus praeposita, et omnia subiecta sunt pedibus eius secundum illud Genesis 1: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram, et praesit piscibus maris* etc. Sed hanc excellentiam perdidit cum peccavit, remansit tamen in ea sublimitatis et excellentiae appetitus. Videns igitur, lumine fidei illustrata, se non posse in pristinam excellentiam restitui, nisi tantum se humiliaret Dei Filius quantum se exaltaverat homo superbus, et credens hoc aliquando futurum, coepit eum vehementer amare. Et quia amans amato desiderat copulari, desideravit gratiam copulam, et quia copulari non poterat gratanter absenti et latenti, ideo desiderat eius praesentiam et apparentiam": *Sermo 1, SDD 1*, 68–69.

[71] *Sermo 3, SDD 1*, 105–106.

[72] *Sermo 4, SDD 1*, 111.

Lord has shown to us. On the literal level, the fervent devotion of the shepherds manifests a willingness to undertake a journey and a corresponding desire to see the audible, physical word, that is, the incarnate Word of the eternal Father, born in Bethlehem. Just as a mental word is enclosed with the vestment of sound when pronounced, so too does the Word take on flesh, and thus become intelligible and perceptible.[73] On the allegorical level, the reference to travel suggests a necessary four-fold *transitus*, while the mention of sight evokes the four-fold vision of God that is sought by contemplatives.[74]

Bonaventure also elaborates on contemplative desire and scriptural hermeneutics in the *Diverse Sermons* dedicated to the saints. In *Sermo 36* of the Feast of St Nicholas, the text from Prov. 20:21, *There is a treasure to be desired, and oil in the dwelling of the just*, together with the protheme from Deut. 32:13, *He set him upon high land: that he might eat the fruits of the fields, that he might suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the hardest stone*, provides a framework for confreres and clerics engaged in preaching and praying the scriptures.[75] According to Bonaventure, the *honey* and *oil* refer to the two senses of scripture, the tropological and the anagogical, which inform the active and contemplative life respectively.[76] The tropological teaches what compassionate actions are to be taken in this world, while the anagogical educates contemplatives about what is to be hoped for and expected in the world to come. Both interpretive senses rely on the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who draws the honey and oil of spiritual understanding from the rocks and stones of the literal sense of sacred scripture, so that pastors may properly nourish the people of God. Indeed, without the graced presence of the Holy Spirit, pastors lack understanding and the corresponding authority to speak of salvation.[77] Bonaventure likewise notes in *Sermo 34* on the Feast of St Andrew the Apostle that longing on the part of the preacher is also crucial in the interpretative dynamic proper to preaching, since just as appetite unites matter with form and

---

[73] *Sermo 2*, *SDD 1*, 87–89. On linguistics and the Incarnation, see *Sermo 3, SDD 1*, 98–101, and Timothy J. Johnson, "Reading between the Lines: Apophatic Knowledge and Naming the Divine in Bonaventure's Book of Creation," in *Franciscan Studies* 60 (2002): 139–158, esp. 142–144.

[74] *Sermo 2, SDD 2*, 93–97.

[75] *Sermo 35, SDD 2*, 470–472.

[76] On Bonaventure's use of the tropological and anagogical senses of Scripture, see Dominic Monti, "Bonaventure's Interpretation of Scripture in his Exegetical Works" (Ph.D. diss., Chicago: 1979), 26–36.

[77] *Sermo 34, SDD 2*, 436.

perfects it, so too desire unites the rational soul with wisdom, thus revealing the arcane mysteries of sacred scripture.[78] Not surprisingly, Bonaventure concludes the protheme of the collation with a petition, "Therefore, we will ask the Lord to give us such a fervent desire for his word that we may merit to perceive the hidden mystery of the word."[79]

The feasts of St Andrew and St Nicholas, with others like that of Agnes,[80] Mark,[81] Mary Magdalene,[82] and Francis of Assisi,[83] are the occasion to consider the blessed as exemplars of sapiential desire. As Carlo Delcorno points out, the medieval sermon, more than any other literary genre, succeeded in conveying hagiographical models to the faithful,[84] and Bonaventure, who willingly turns to narrative when preaching,[85] regards the saints as both resplendent with wisdom and gladdened with desire. On the Feast of All Saints, the Seraphic Doctor notes that the community of the blessed is spoken of in Rev. 21:2, *And I John saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband*. The holy city, rendered glorious by the power of the Father, is beautiful to behold, because of the illuminative wisdom of the Son, and gladdened with desire coursing from the Holy Spirit.[86] Such desire, as illustrated by the saints, teaches that proper delight is found in the company of the blessed, not among those who seek happiness in the senses. To neglect the example of the saints is to exchange the pleasure of true union for a fleeting phantasm, like the boy who tried to grab gold he saw in a picture, or the idiot who glimpsed the shadow of the moon in a well and descended to seize it, or the dog who sighted the shadow of some meat in the water, and entered it.[87]

The Sunday Sermons

As Jacques Bougerol notes, scholars have generally ascribed these *Sunday Sermons* to Bonaventure's university period, roughly between 1250 and 1257.

---

[78] *Sermo 34, Collatio*, *SDD 2*, 447.

[79] "Ideo rogabimus Dominum quod det nobis ita fervens desiderium ad verbum suum ut percipere mereamur verbi mysterium arcanum": *Sermo 34, Collatio, SDD 2*, 447.

[80] *Sermo 37, SDD 2*, 501–502.

[81] *Sermo 44, SDD 2*, 591–592.

[82] *Sermo 48, SDD 2*, 633.

[83] *Sermo 57, SDD 2*, 769; *Sermo 58, SDD 2*, 784–785; and *Sermo 59, SDD 2*, 792.

[84] Carlo Delcorno, *Exemplum e letterature: tra Medievo e Rinascimento* (Bologna: 1989), 25.

[85] Delcorno, *Exemplum e letterature*, 48.

[86] *Sermo 61, SDD 2*, 823–825.

[87] *Sermo 61, SDD 2*, 825.

While Longpré spoke of the period from 1253 to 1257, Mehr, Bougerol, and Manselli narrowed the timeframe to 1250–1251, while Brady and Quinn posited 1252–1253, and Cantini, Glorieux, di Fonzo, Clasen, and Dufiel spoke in favor of 1252–1253.[88] Although they disagreed on the dates, all these scholars claimed the *Sunday Sermons* originated within a single academic year. This view, however, is untenable, in view of the context of preaching at the University of Paris and the content of the *Sunday Sermons*. University statutes invited masters to preach *coram universitate* once a year. While Bougerol acknowledges that some may have done so more frequently, none left a complete series comparable to the *Sunday Sermons*.[89] As a member of the Parisian Minorite *studium*, Bonaventure undoubtedly also preached within the convent on selected Sundays for the brothers, yet other confreres, both masters and bachelors at St Magdalene, would have done likewise during the academic year. Furthermore, these sermons *coram fratribus* were typically directed toward those in religious formation.[90] The content of the *Sunday Sermons*, while certainly intended to promote the intellectual and spiritual growth of the brothers,[91] does not reveal a decided emphasis on the importance of academic development or the formation concerns of Bonaventure's young Minorite confreres such as is evident in the *Instructions for Novices*, but suggests instead a more mature and cultured audience of preachers, religious and prelates.

The *Sunday Sermons* emerge as a unique collection of sermons when compared with the *Seasonal* and *Diverse Sermons*; they give voice to Bonaventure's desire to pastor the brothers, through the mediated presence of an edited sermon collection intended not to assist them so much in their preaching to the laity, but rather, to call the preachers themselves to conversion through a meditation on the Sundays of the liturgical year. At the heart of this collection lies Bonaventure's reflection on the passion of Christ, which the minister general recounts in a rare autobiographical reference found in the *Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost*:

> Second, the soul has a religious posture that remains steadfast in overcoming diabolical temptations with strength. Whence Ephesians 6:11; 14 says: *Put on the armor of God so you may resist the snares of the devil*; and: *Gird*

[88] Bougerol, *SDM*, 16–17.

[89] San Bonaventura, *Sermoni domenicali*, ed. Jacques Bougerol, Cornelio del Zotto, and Leonardo Sileo (Opere di San Bonaventura) 10 (Rome: 1992), 7.

[90] Bougerol, "Les sermons dans les 'studia' des mendiants," in *Le scuole degli ordini mendicanti*, 254–270.

[91] Bériou, *L'avènement*, vol. 1, 187.

> *your loins with truth and put on the breastplate of justice*. The armor we must wear to overcome diabolical temptations is the passion of Christ; if this memory is evoked affectionately, every demon flees in terror immediately, as experience has taught me on numerous occasions. For once, when the devil grasped me by the throat and tried to strangle me with such a tight grip of the throat that I was unable to call out to the friars for help, I began to breathe out with unimaginable pain; suddenly overcome by the memory of the Lord's passion, I multiplied my gasps out of compassion for his suffering. As I surrendered, feverish groans began to replace the sound of my voice. By virtue of what took place through the passion of the Lord, I, a servant of the cross, composed this present collection of sermons to praise the name of Christ and to honor his sacred cross, and testify that I was freed from such a cruel death.[92]

Bonaventure's appeal to personal experience, and his compilation of sermons mindful of the Lord's passion, foregrounds a commitment to pastoral care for his confreres. Unable to encounter each one, because of their sheer numbers and of geographical distances, the minister general nevertheless sought to overcome this "pastoral gap" with a scripted journey[93] through the liturgical year, where he speaks to the *homo interior* of individual brothers as he guides them into the mysteries of salvation manifested in the cross of Christ. Throughout the *Sunday Sermons*, Bonaventure's memory evokes the images, ideas, and words that Mary Carruthers identifies as essential to the craft of meditation.[94]

---

[92] "Secundo illa anima habet religiosum gestum, quae stat viriliter ad superandum diabolica tentamenta. Unde ad Ephesios 6:11; 14: *Induite vos armaturam Dei, ut possitis stare adversus insidias diaboli*; et sequitur: *State ergo succincti lumbos vestros in veritate, induti loricam iustitiae*. Ista *armatura*, qua debemus induit ad hoc, ut possimus superare diabolica tentamenta, est memoria passionis Christi; quae si ad memoriam affectuose reducatur, statim omnes daemones cum tremore effugantur, secundum quod experientia me docuit pluries. Nam semel, cum diabolus fortiter me stringens in gutture, vellet strangulare, iam non valens prae nimia strictione gutturis clamare, ut fratrum adiutorium impetrarem, incipiebam cum ingenti dolore spiritum exhalare; statimque habita dominicae passionis memoria, incepi ex compassione dominicae passionis singultus geminare et ignita suspiria loco vocis submittens cordis medullis emittere. Quo facto, virtute dominicae passionis, ego servus crucis, qui praesens sermonum opusculum ad laudem nominis Christi et sanctae crucis honorem compegi, a tam crudeli nece profiteor me esse liberatum." *Sermo 40, SDM*, 407. On the autobiographical aspect of this text, see Bougerol, *Sermones dominicales*, 105–107.

[93] On Bonaventure's scripting of his confreres' spiritual journey, see Timothy J. Johnson, "Prologue as Pilgrimage: Bonaventure as Spiritual Cartographer," *Miscellanea Francescana* 106–107 (2006–2007): 445–464.

[94] Mary Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images* (Cambridge: 1998), 4.

The *cursus* of meditation also allows Bonaventure to construct a lucid image of the preacher for each individual reader, as he invites his confreres into the christological mysteries of the liturgical year. An examination of the prothemes in the *Sunday Sermons* shows that ministry entails a performative praying and preaching of the Scriptures that is imaged within the personal meditation of each brother.[95] This identity of the individual emerges from the reflective integration of Bonaventure's own prothematic prayers, which evoke a sense of indigency before God and a concomitant longing to serve others in humility. These desires of Bonaventure, the prayerful preacher, are mediated through rumination on the scriptural themes proper to each Sunday celebration. To meditate with the *Sunday Sermons* is to initiate a performance where praying and preaching are internalized in anticipation of ministerial engagement. The particular identity Bonaventure seeks is that of the *viri spirituales* or spiritual men, whose lives are defined by contemplative reflection and the spirited proclamation of the scriptures in a primarily urban context. This identity is articulated in the *Journey of the Mind into God*, the *Major Life of Saint Francis*, and the *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*. In the *Journey of the Mind into God* from 1259, Bonaventure proposes Francis as a second Jacob-Israel, an exemplar of the active-contemplative synthesis for other spiritual men.[96] This performantive interpretation of the Poverello also appears in the *Major Life of Saint Francis*, as Bonaventure reworks earlier hagiographical material in accord with his established active-contemplative hermeneutic. In Thomas of Celano's *Life of Saint Francis* from 1229, Francis appears in a nocturnal vision to his companions gathered in prayer,[97] but in Bonaventure's account from around 1263,[98] this event takes place in Rivotorto after Francis has preached in the cathedral of Assisi and withdrawn in the evening to pray. Now the Poor Man of Assisi embodies the Minorite model of urban preaching, and those who emulate this performative pattern are spiritual men in the tradition of Elijah. In the *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, redacted most probably around the time of the *Sunday Sermons*,[99] the defining virtue of Bonaventure's

---

[95] On Bonaventure's use of prothemes, see Timothy J. Johnson, "The Prothemes of Bonaventure's Sermones Dominicales and Minorite Prayer," in idem, *Franciscans at Prayer* (Leiden: 2007), 95–122.

[96] *Itin.* 7.3 (5, 312b).

[97] *1 Celano*, c. 18, n. 47 in *Fontes Franciscani*, ed. Enrico Menestò and Stefano Brufani (Assisi: 1995), 321–322.

[98] *Leg. maj*, c. 4, n. 4 (8, 513b–514a).

[99] Monti, "Bonaventure's Interpretation," 155.

viri spirituales is humility, since Christ and the apostles before them were willing to be seated among the lowly at the wedding banquet.[100] Like Mary and Martha who preceded them, they must learn how to serve and be served; namely, how to integrate the active and contemplative dimensions of the spiritual life within their ministerial activities.[101] While the ecclesial vocations of the *viri spirituales* is ultimately realized in the midst of ministry, it can already be internalized in the company of the minister general, through meditation on the carefully crafted prothemes of the *Sunday Sermons*.

Collations at the University of Paris

The relatively brief period of time in which Bonaventure redacted the text of the *Sunday Sermons* for his confreres throughout Europe also witnessed an intense engagement with the intellectual and spiritual issues confronting his brothers at the University of Paris. In the Lenten season of 1267, he offered a series of sermons known as the *Collations on the Ten Commandments* and another series, the *Collations on the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, in the same liturgical season of 1268. After Easter of 1273, he would return to the university to undertake yet another series, albeit incomplete, known as the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*.[102] The titles of these three texts draw attention to their unique genre, since the Latin *collatio* evokes a specific form of preaching expected from a master of theology in the thirteenth century in addition to his obligation to comment on biblical and theological texts and dispute selected theological questions.[103] As Jacqueline Hamesse notes, the statutes of the University of Paris outline the purpose and parameters of the *collatio* as sermon, but the term nevertheless remains rather ambiguous.[104] *Collatio*, which in earlier monastic

[100] *Comm. Luc.* 9.89 (7, 245a).

[101] *Comm. Luc.*, 10.75 (7, 276a).

[102] According to Bougerol, the *Collations on the Ten Commandments* and the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit* are definitely from the Lenten seasons of 1267 and 1268 respectively, while the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation* spanned a broader period between 9 April and 29 May: see Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction a l'étude*, 180, 182–183, and 186. On the dating of the Collations, see also P. Glorieux, "La date des collations de Saint Bonaventure," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 22 (1929): 257–272.

[103] Jacqueline Hamesse, "'Collatio' et 'Reportatio': Deux vocables specifiques de la vie intellectuelle au moyen âge," in *Termonologie de la vie intellectuale au moyen âge*, ed. Olga Weijers (Turnhout: 1985), 78–79.

[104] Hamesse, "'Collatio'," 81–82.

circles consisted of spiritual conferences,[105] takes on an additional meaning in the thirteenth century and refers to an evening sermon within the context of vespers that completed the subject matter presented in the morning at the eucharistic liturgy on a Sunday or feast day. *Sermo 10*, an Epiphany sermon which Jacques Bougerol believes Bonaventure preached to his brothers at the University of Paris on 6 January 1268,[106] and *Sermo 57* on St Francis, from 4 October 1267, exemplify this two-fold pattern of morning and evening sermon.[107] Bonaventure found this Parisian practice of attending both a morning and evening sermon commendable, although an extant *collatio* for the Feast of St Francis from 1262 reveals that his enthusiasm was by no means universal.[108] When the term *collatio* appears in the plural, as in the case of Bonaventure's three *Collationes*, it denotes a series of Saturday evening conferences on a selected theme. Although these conferences are not determined by a liturgical celebration, they are still considered sermons since they adhere to the preaching genre through their intentional usage of specific techniques common to the *sermo modernus*.[109]

The analysis of Bonaventure's three *Collationes*, in particular the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*, rightly underscores the Averroist controversy at the University of Paris, and the desire on the part of the Minorite minister general to ward off the masters like Siger of Brabant who espoused this radical form of Aristotelian philosophy.[110] Their position regarding

---

[105] Hamesse, " 'Collatio'," 79.

[106] *Sermo 10, SDD 2*, 180–200.

[107] *Sermo 57, SDD 2*, 749–771.

[108] "Aliqui dicunt: quid tot faciunt modo sermones, quod vertuntur in taedium et derisorium? Sed non est verum, animae bene dispositae non vertuntur in taedium; anima bene disposita libenter omni hora audit loqui de Deo, de creatore suo. Sic enim anima quae libenter addiscit, quacumque hora libenter audit ut addiscat, nec propter lectionem ordinariam quam audit in mane, dimittit cursoriam in nona, nec negligit eam, sed libenter eam audit. Sic est de anima bene disposita ad audiendum verbum Dei quod propter sermonem quem audit in mane, non dimittit, quin audiat libenter in sero, et si non proficiat ibi quandoque neque multum addiscat, tamen si placet ei libenter audire loqui de creatore suo, magnum meritum est. Inter consuetudines approbatas haec est una de melioribus quod scholares huius civitatis libenter veniunt ad audiendum verbum Dei. Est ergo praedicandum et seminandum verbum divinum et in mane et in sero": *Sermo 58, SDD 2*, 772–773.

[109] Hamesse, " 'Collatio'," 81–82. See also Louis Jacques Bataillon, "Sermoni e orazioni d'ambiente universitario parigino nel sec. XIII," *Rivista della Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino* 5 (1994): 297–298.

[110] Bougerol, *Introduction a l'étude*, 179. On Bonaventure's use of Aristotle, see Jacques Guy Bougerol, "Dossier pour l'étude des rapports entre Saint Bonaventure et Aristote," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 40 (1973): 135–222.

the intellect and the eternity of the world promised to subvert the most basic tenets of Christian doctrine, and thus led to condemnations in 1270 and 1277. Bonaventure himself confessed in the second collation of the *Collations on the Ten Commandments* that the Averroist teaching was perturbing:

> I heard, when I was a student, that Aristotle posited that the world was eternal; and when I heard the reasons and arguments which were made in this regard, my heart began to be disturbed and I began to think, how can this be?[111]

Bonaventure's admission notwithstanding, his impulse to confront a prevalent and, in his view, dangerous worldview is not the only motive behind the *Collations on the Ten Commandments*,[112] the later *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit* and the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*. These conferences unfolded against a backdrop of Joachimite influence among many Minorites in Paris and elsewhere, including the philosopher Roger Bacon, whose embrace of the sciences and acerbic critique of scholastic teaching and preaching practices undoubtedly ran counter to Bonaventure's institutional stance.[113] The threefold *Collations*, which treated first the commandments of the Old Testament, then the gifts of the Holy Spirit revealed in the New Testament, and finally the ecclesial vision proper to the Franciscan order, stand in counter distinction to Joachim of Fiore's three ages of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and foreground the Minorite vocation within the universal, yet historical church. The impending Second Council of Lyon, which would force Bonaventure to depart from Paris before completing the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*, may have also

---

[111] "Audivi, cum scholaris, de Aristotele, quod posuit mundum aeternum: et cum audivi rationes et argumenta, quae fiebant ad hoc, incepit concuti cor meum et incepit cogitare, quomodo potest hoc esse?": *De dec. praec.* 2.28 (5, 515a–b).

[112] Bonaventure, *Collations on the Ten Commandments*, intro. and trans. Paul J. Spaeth (Saint Bonaventure: 1995), 8.

[113] On Bonaventure, Joachim of Fiore, and the Franciscan order, see Paul Zahner, *Die Fülle des Heils in der Endlichkeit der Geschichte. Bonaventuras Theologie als Antwort auf die franziskanischen Joachiten* (Werl/Westfalen: 1999), and Jan van den Eijnden, "Bonaventura und das Gedankengut des Joachim von Fiore. Der Einfluss des franziskanischen Kontexts auf eine theologische Diskussion," *Collectanea Franciscana* 71.1–2 (2001): 65–85. On Roger Bacon and Joachimism, see Stewart C. Easton, *Roger Bacon and His Search for a Universal Science. A Reconsideration of the Life and Work of Roger Bacon in the Light of His Own Stated Purposes* (Oxford: 1952), 126–137, and Camille Bérubé, "Le 'dialogue' de s. Bonaventure et de Roger Bacon," *Collectanea Franciscana* 39 (1969): 88.

influenced the minister general.[114] These and other factors, such as the need for reform in the order and the ongoing struggle with the secular masters in regard to the legitimacy of the mendicants in the late 1260s and early 1270s, suggest that exclusive emphasis on the philosophical-doctrinal contents of Bonaventure's *Collations* risks obscuring their decidedly pastoral-spiritual hue. Since his election as minister general in 1257, the overarching, integrative impetus behind his writings was the spiritual welfare of his confreres. To this end he traveled and preached throughout Europe, while composing numerous texts addressed to those who shared his calling to the religious life. An anonymous reporter of one extant version of the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation* stated there were one hundred and sixty brothers in attendance when Bonaventure preached in the Minorite convent in Paris.[115] This very well may have been the case for the two preceding conference series, thus suggesting that the primary audience for this threefold conference series consisted of fellow Franciscans, many of them young students, all brothers for whom Bonaventure bore an admittedly weighty pastoral burden. Readers of these *Collationes* thus encounter three moments where Bonaventure, albeit with philosophical and doctrinal sophistication, engages confreres as their pastor with his preaching. In a manner reminiscent of the earlier monastic *collatio*, he guides them into the depths of an authentic spirituality, worthy of their aspirations as second-generation followers of the Poverello.

Collations on the Ten Commandments

The *Collations on the Ten Commandments* was not the first time Bonaventure addressed his brothers on the Decalogue. In 1257, he took up the question of the commandments in the *Breviloquium*, which is considered a pivotal text demarcating his transition from the life of a university professor to that of the foremost pastor of the Franciscan order.[116] Taking a decidedly deductive approach, he situates the commandments in the broad context of a discussion of grace and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Christians are required to exercise the gift of grace by believing, loving, following the

[114] On this possibility, see C. Colt Anderson, *A Call to Piety: St. Bonaventure's Collations on the Six Days* (Quincy: 2002).

[115] S. Bonaventurae, *Collationes in Hexaëmeron et Bonaventurae quaedam selecta*, ed. Ferdinandus Delorme (Quaracchi: 1934), 275.

[116] Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, trans. and ed. Dominic V. Monti (Saint Bonaventure: 2005), xv.

divine precepts of the law, and praying.[117] The appearance and appropriate comprehension of the Decalogue is grounded in the nature of God, who justly governs the universe.[118] Since justice requires each person give what is rightfully due to others, the commandments inform his confreres about what constitutes a proper relationship with God and humanity.[119] This relational dynamic is the unitive argument Bonaventure returns to a decade later in the thoughtful, yet surprisingly accessible language of the *Collations on the Ten Commandments*.[120] This series of conferences, running from 6 March to 17 April 1267, are extant in numerous manuscripts.[121] What is noteworthy at the outset is their uncomplicated form of presentation that reflects, perhaps, a decidedly younger audience of religious. Bonaventure sees in the Decalogue a divine pedagogy that lends itself to introductory questions of faith because the commandments are written in the most concise, clearest, and comprehensible manner possible. Accordingly, no one should find these laws too burdensome to remember, too difficult to understand, or too onerous to the will. Utilizing synecdoche, whereby each commandment is understood in terms of every commandment and every commandment is comprehensible through individual commandments, the Creator further simplifies the divine didactic.[122] The minister general's attempt to preach in a similar straightforward fashion is furthered by stories recounted by the saints and *exempla*—a relatively rare occurrence in his sermon corpus. The audience of the *Collations on the Ten Commandments* hears of a man who worshiped the devil in exchange for riches,[123] of the demon who adored the eucharist,[124] of the foul-mouthed six-year-old sent to hell,[125] of the Parisian master who honored his poor mother,[126] and of the poor son who, having married into a rich family, nevertheless despised his father by following his wife's command and was subsequently suffocated by a toad.[127]

---

[117] *Brevil.*, pars 5, c. 7, n. 1.
[118] *Brevil.*, pars 5, c. 7, n. 2.
[119] *Brevil*, p. 5, c. 7, nn. 4–5.
[120] Hanspeter Heinz, *Trinitarische Begegnugen bei Bonaventura: Fruchtbarkeit einer appropriativen Trinitätstheologie* (Münster: 1985), 15ff.
[121] *De dec. praec.* (5, xlii–xlv).
[122] *De dec. praec.* 2.5 (5, 511b) and 5.4 (5, 523a).
[123] *De dec. praec.* 2.23 (5, 514a–b).
[124] *De dec. praec.* 3.14 (5, 517b).
[125] *De dec. prae.* 3.27 (5, 519b).
[126] *De dec. praec.* 5.20 (5, 525a–b).
[127] *De dec. praec.* 5.21 (5, 525b).

The stories and *exempla* Bonaventure utilizes coalesce around the themes of worship and authority, which bear directly on how individuals relate to God and to those with power. While the *Collations on the Ten Commandments* treat the entire Decalogue, they emphasize the first four commandments—hence the didactic stories. This predilection is evident in the content and space devoted to the development of each collation. The first collation is introductory; collations 2, 3, and 4 treat the first, second, and third commandments in detail, as does the fifth collation where Bonaventure elaborates on the fourth commandment. Collation 6 rapidly covers the fifth, sixth, and seventh commandments while collation 7 briefly touches on the eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments. Issues such as murder, adultery, stealing, and lying get short shrift, as Bonaventure refuses to go beyond a cursory, literal interpretation of the laws regarding these offenses against others. His interests lie in the literal-spiritual understanding of the commandments detailing the proper stance before the Creator and those who govern within the ecclesial community. The two tables of the Decalogue encompass divine and human justice,[128] but the minister general accentuates the divine dimension and urges listeners to turn away from the false idols of demonic magic, erroneous philosophical and scriptural interpretations, and a disproportionate love of the material world. They should guard their speech, never taking God's name in vain by negating the power of the sacraments, by reneging on sacred promises, or by speaking blasphemously. As might be expected from clerical students, they are to keep the sabbath holy by turning to God in love through their interior and exterior works that are common to the religious life:

> Conversion into God takes place through seven works without which the soul is unable to come to perfect rest in God: three of these are *intrinsic*: they are done *by meditating, praying*, and *exultating*; these three bring about contemplation. The other four are *extrinsic*, which are done *by reading, singing psalms, offering sacrifice* and *fulfilling* the divine *law*; and these are done by hearing, teaching, or conferring with others.[129]

---

[128] *De dec. praec*. 1.21 (5, 510a).

[129] "Conversio autem in Deum est secundum septem opera, sine quibus anima non convertitur ad perfectam vacationem in Deum; quorum tria sunt *intrinseca*, quae fiunt *meditando, orando*, et *exsultando*; et ex tribus resultat contemplatio. Alia quatuor sunt *extrinseca*, quae fiunt *legendo, psallendo, sacrificum offerendo* et divinam *legem adimplendo*; et hoc fit sive audiendo, sive docendo, sive cum aliis conferendo": *De dec. praec.* 4.12 (5, 521b).

Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit

In the Lenten season of 1268, Bonaventure returns to the collation genre with a notable emphasis on the pneumatalogical dimensions of the Christian life within a trinitarian framework. Manuscript studies of the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit* by Jacqueline Hamesse have clarified the contents and contours of the conferences, which are conserved in three *reportationes*. The Quaracchi editors chose the first *reportatio* when preparing the *Opera Omnia* of St Bonaventure, which conflated the text by including a sermon on the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary. This sermon from Sunday, 24 March is the second part of the sixth collation and the first part the seventh collation in the Quarrachi version.[130] When this text is revised in the light of Hamesse's work, the pnemumatalogical emphasis of Bonaventure's Marian theology is more readily apparent. Mary's son is also pivotal to the question of grace. Despite Bonaventure's abiding interest in Christological themes, the *Collations on the Ten Commandments* rarely spoke of Christ and preferred to speak of God as Creator with scant reference to the Holy Spirit, and with no mention of Mary. In the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, interest is now directed toward the New Testament revelation in Christ, not the Old Testament revelation through Moses. After acknowledging his conference series of the preceding year, the minister general informs his audience that grace is more essential for salvation than the law, since grace and truth come through Jesus, the incarnate, crucified, and inspired Word of God.[131] As he had previously outlined in the *Breviloquium*, it is this grace that enables believers to carry out the Decalogue in justice. Grace is a theme that is present throughout Bonaventure's writings beginning with his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, and his many sermons, in particular, afforded the opportunity to speak about the manifold gifts, power, and influence of the third Person of the Trinity. For example, the Pentecost sermon in the *Sunday Sermons* reminds the brothers of how the apostles depended on the Holy Spirit, and that they must do likewise lest they be deceived into believing in their own strengths.[132]

The *Collations on the Holy Spirit* afforded Bonaventure the occasion to unfold an authoritative proposal for spiritual growth grounded in the

---

[130] Jacqueline Hamesse, "La prédication universitaire: éloquence sacrée, éloquence profane," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 105 (1991): 287–296.

[131] *De don. Spir.* 1.2–7 (5, 457b–458b).

[132] *Sermo 27, SDM*, 320.

fear of the Lord and culminating in the exquisite wisdom of those who dwell in the house of the Lord. Piety, knowledge, fortitude, counsel, and understanding comprise the intervening stages of development, each gift flowing into the other to form a vibrant synthesis of doctrine and practice. The pressing challenges of the day, such as the Averroist controversy and the assault on mendicant legitimacy, are handled as potential, impending obstacles to the reception of grace, not as abstract philosophical issues or distant ecclesiastical struggles. In the eighth collation on the gift of understanding, Bonaventure reminds the professors and students in attendance that no matter how talented they may be, divine enlightenment is required for the certitude of salvific wisdom. To emulate their Averroist masters and colleagues by positing ways of knowledge exclusive of grace, is to cut oneself off from God, who is the cause of being, the ground of understanding, and the form of proper living.[133] When it comes to his brothers' place in the Church, the Minister General defines their adversaries as Pharisees and lawyers—a particularly telling comment, given his earlier comments on the subordination of the law to grace. Evoking these detractors present at the university, he recounts how they dissuade those entering the Minorites or Preachers by discounting the value of the evangelical counsels.[134] Bonaventure's willingness to speak to the current problems facing his Parisian confreres confirms his pastoral preoccupation. He states, therefore, at the outset of the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, that he will not speak about the beatitudes of the future life, but, instead, will consciously situate himself in the middle,[135] that is to say, in the midst of this present life where the Holy Spirit strengthens the virtuous attempts of those dedicated to the Lord. Bonaventure holds that this Holy Spirit, especially through the gift of wisdom, desires to build up the church, by constructing a dwelling place for God within each soul. Chastity of the body, innocence of the mind, moderation of speech, docility in affection, generosity in action, maturity in judgment and simplicity in intention constitute the seven solid pillars of this divine abode.[136]

---

[133] *De don. Spir.* 8.15 (5, 496b–497b).
[134] *De don. Spir.* 7.17 (5, 492a–b).
[135] *De don. Spir.* 1.18 (5, 461b).
[136] *De don. Spir.* 9.7–17 (5, 500b–503b).

Collations on the Six Days of Creation

In the spring of 1273, Bonaventure began his last collation series, the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*, which are found in the Quarrachi[137] and Delorme editions.[138] Appealing to the earlier spatial imagery of the *Collations on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, he speaks in the liturgical season between Easter and Pentecost of the Church and the activities fitting to the house of God. Two other sermons with similar architectonic language, which could be dated to the 1267–1268 period, suggest that the figure of the church served as an increasingly important hermeneutic category in the later years of Bonaventure's pastoral ministry. One sermon at the Parisian convent of the Preachers elaborates on the purgation, illumination, and perfection befitting prayer in God's house,[139] while the other in the *Sunday Sermons* identifies the church as the prayerful site of the threefold hierarchization of the soul, salvific teaching, and the sacramental refreshment of inebriating wisdom.[140] The opening lines of the first collation in the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*, taken from Sir. 15:5 and repeated at the beginning of the second and third collations, remind his confreres that the church is the locus of wisdom, *And in the midst of the church she shall open his mouth, and shall fill him with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, and shall clothe him with a robe of glory*.[141] The church, not the synagogue, is the suitable place to speak since the house of God is constructed with the foundation and columns of faith for those who understand, as opposed to those who act like animals.[142] Those gathered within the church are the *viri ecclesiatici*, who are united by their mutual observance of the divine law, love of divine peace, and the performance of divine praise.[143] Other architectonic descriptions appear in the second and third collation, as Bonaventure foregrounds his magisterial exposition of wisdom within the church: disciplined desire is the door to

[137] *Hex.* (5, 329a–449b).
[138] S. Bonaventurae, *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, ed. Delorme. On the manuscript tradition and the possibility of a new critical text of the *Hexaëmeron* based on the Saint Petersburg manuscript Lat. Qv. I:219, see Pietro Maranesi, "Bonaventura of Bagnoregio: A transcription of the third collation of the *Hexaëmeron* from the St. Petersburg manuscript," *Franciscan Studies* 53 (1993): 47–78.
[139] *Sermo 31*, *SDD 1*, 391–396.
[140] *Sermo 36*, *SDM*, 379–385.
[141] *Hex.* 1.1 (5, 329a).
[142] *Hex.* 1.1–3 (5, 329a–330a).
[143] *Hex.* 1.5 (5, 330a).

wisdom,[144] and the key of contemplation, which leads back into God, is the Uncreated, Incarnate, and Inspired Word of God.[145] This conscious use of church imagery illustrates his efforts throughout his tenure as minister general to define Minorite self-understanding in terms of interior, legislative, and ecclesial space. The *Collations on the Six Days of Creation* mark the culmination of his efforts, initiated in the 1267–1268 period, to delineate the Minorite identity as an ecclesial identity. His confreres are not Joachim of Fiore's *viri spirituales* of the Age of the Spirit, but they are the true *viri spirituales* whose identity is found within the church as *viri ecclesiatici*.

Bonaventure evoked the image of the church among his confreres gathered in the convent of St Mary Magdalene against the backdrop of the impending General Council in Lyon, which Gregory X announced on 31 March 1272. The most pressing issue from the papal perspective was the question of a new Crusade, followed by the hope for union with the Greek church. Ecclesial reform, under the title of *reformatio morum*, was also to be examined with an emphasis on the exaggerated proliferation of mendicant movements.[146] Following a tradition reaching back perhaps as far as Papias of Hierapolis in the second century, the Seraphic Doctor proposed to interpret the six days of creation in terms of the church and Christ, but Gregory X appointed him and several other influential clerics to the cardinalate on 28 May 1273 in preparation for the council.[147] The untimely conclusion of the series, which had treated only four days, is echoed in the disappointment of at least one of Bonaventure's confreres, "However the three ultimate visions would have contained more than the previously mentioned four. But alas, alas, alas, they were not able to be continued since the lord and master of this work was raised to a higher state and left this life."[148] His confrere's judgment aside, the twenty-one collations preached by Bonaventure are arguably the most compelling synthesis of his wisdom theology, and their textual incompleteness only accentuates their breathtaking intellectual and spiritual profundity. His

---

[144] *Hex*. 2.6 (5, 337b).

[145] *Hex*. 3.2 (5, 343a).

[146] Antonio Franchi, *Il concilio di Lione (1274) secondo La Ordinatio concilii generalis lugdunensis* (Rome: 1965), 122–132.

[147] Burkhard Roberg, *Das Zweite Konzil von Lyon [1274]* (Paderborn: 1990), 155–158.

[148] "Istae autem tres ultimae visiones adhuc magis continerent quam quattuor praedictae. Sed heu! heu! heu! superveniente statu excelsiori et vitae excessu domini et magistri huius operis, procecutionem prosecuturi non acceperunt": S. Bonaventurae, *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, ed. Delorme, 275.

soaring reflections throughout are grounded in the incarnational reality of the cosmic *reductio*, which has significance both for him and for his confreres:

> . . . as the Son said, *I came forth from the Father, and I am come into the world: again I leave the world, and I go to the Father*; as so one says: Lord, I came forth from you the most high, I come to you the most high and through you the most high—This is the metaphysical medium that restores, and this is our entire metaphysics concerning: emanation, exemplarity, consummation, that is to be illuminated through spiritual rays and restored to the most high. And thus you will be a true metaphysician.[149]

Bonaventure elaborates on the myriad illuminations in collations 4 through 21 that should lead the brothers back to the most high God, and in the process refuses to shy away from identifying those philosophical and even pedagogical errors that could impede or detour the spiritual progress of the *viri ecclesiastici* as true metaphysicians. The first illumination, which comprises collations 4 through 7, speaks of understanding through nature, morals, virtues, and the need for grace. To share in the grace of the Holy Spirit is to accept the healing medicine from the Incarnate Word, who safeguards the true metaphysician from the plight of the philosophers. Their affective powers have not been healed, rightly ordered, or rectified; they are rendered similar to ostriches with stunted wings, and they tumble into the darkness.[150] The following five collations of the second illumination concern understanding assisted by faith. The testimony of faith is expressed in the Uncreated, Incarnate, and Inspired Word, and this truth radiates through the power of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those who preach and write.[151] Through faith, contemplation of God as one and triune are possible, as is the understanding of divine exemplarity,[152] which Bonaventure professed as essential to the true metaphysician. The third illumination, which treats the relationship between sacred scripture and understanding, is found in collations 13 through 19. Dissimilar to the illegible book of creation, the book of scripture is a trustworthy text for the true

---

[149] "sicut Filius dixit: *Exivi a Patre et veni in mundum, iterum relinquo mundum et vado ad Patrem*, sicut dicat quilibet: Domine, exivi a te summo, venio ad te summum et per te summum.—Hoc est medium *metaphysicum* reducens, et haec est tota nostra metaphysica: de emanatione, de exemplaritate, de consummatione, scilicet illuminari per radios spirituales et reduci ad summum. Et sic eris verus metaphysicus": *Hex.*, col. 1, n. 17 (5, 332a–b).

[150] *Hex.* 7.10–12 (5, p. 367a).

[151] *Hex.* 9.1–7 (5, 372a–373b).

[152] *Hex.* 12.1–2 (5, 384a–385a).

metaphysician because it illumines the reader, thus fostering the knowledge, praise, and love proper to the return to God.[153] These collations have a certain nobility, since God brought forth life on the earth on the third day,[154] and sacred scripture likewise has a viviving influence.[155] Calling to mind Francis of Assisi's sermon to the Sultan, Bonaventure reminds his confreres that philosophy has the opposite impact, since reason is unable to lead anyone to faith.[156] The final three collations of the fourth illumination address the celestial hierarchy, as well as the hierarchy of the Church militant and the human soul. Desire and contemplation are the dominant subjects, as the interplay between the active and contemplative life is delineated for the *viri ecclesiastici* in the convent of St Mary Magdalene.[157] They should dedicate themselves to speculative study of the sacred scripture, but recall the example of St Francis and remember that there is little value in knowing about God, if they are incapable of tasting the divine reality[158] and savoring the ecstatic experience of Jacob[159] that enables them to ascend to God above and descend to the world below.[160]

Conclusion

While the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation* signal the zenith of Bonaventure's theological project, they were by no means the conclusion of his ministerial preaching. Biographical accounts tend to move swiftly from the abrupt conclusion of his last collation series in Paris to a fleeting mention of the activity of the cardinal of Albano at the Second Council of Lyon, and end with his inopportune death there on 15 July 1274. Extant sermons and the council chronicle confirm, however, that Bonaventure's dedication to what Peter Cantor termed the third obligation of the master theologian was as intense and nuanced as ever, after the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*. In fact, one sermon indicates that he took up the creation account again with his confreres in Lyon, with a corresponding emphasis on Christ as the Son and Word of God.[161] Another sermon in December of 1273, in which Bonaventure refers to the Old Testament

[153] *Hex.* 13.12–13 (5, 390a).
[154] *Hex.* 13.1 (5, 388a).
[155] *Hex.* 14.1 (5, 393a).
[156] *Hex.* 19.14 (5, 422b).
[157] *Hex.* 20.19–20 (5, 428b–429a).
[158] *Hex.* 22.21 (5, 440b).
[159] *Hex.* 23.30 (5, 449b).
[160] *Hex.* 23.31 (5, 449b).
[161] *Sermo 186, SDT*, 253–254.

figure of David as holy and consecrated, is noteworthy because it is the first available example of his preaching after the confirmation of his cardinalate in Lyon on 11 November, and takes place in the presence of Gregory X, many other cardinals, and the entire Roman curia.[162] Altogether, Jacques Bougerol identified as many as 14 sermons in 1273 after Bonaventure's departure for Lyon,[163] and another 7 in 1274.[164] The city of Lyon is the locus for these sermons, which are offered primarily for the local Minorite community in December 1273 and January 1274. As we would expect, the liturgical season determined the sermon themes and content, so much attention is directed to the Incarnation of Christ and subsequent enlightenment of the peoples prefigured in the Magi. Bonaventure's last sermon before the council on Eph. 5:8, *Let us walk as sons of the light*, continued the illumination motif as he urged his brothers to live dignified, productive lives, since they should outdo others in holiness, just as light surpasses all other material in excellence.[165]

With the opening of the Second Council of Lyon, textual evidence of Bonaventure's preaching diminishes and unfortunately no known extant sermons remain. What is available, however, is the *Ordinatio* of the council that reports that Bonaventure preached in the second session where the union of the Roman and Greek Churches was the subject of discussion and the text from Bar. 5:5 was most opportune: *Arise, O Jerusalem, and stand on high: and look about towards the east, and behold thy children gathered together from the rising to the setting sun, by the word of the Holy One rejoicing in the remembrance of God*.[166] What is most likely the final sermon of Bonaventure's life was given in the third session at the papal Mass, celebrated in the presence of the Greek representatives to the council, on the Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul, 29 June 1274.[167] From then on, the *Ordinatio* is silent in regard to the Cardinal of Albano until the fourth session when his passing and funeral is noted:

---

[162] *Sermo 11, SDT*, 63–64.

[163] *Sermo 241, SDT*, 334–335; *Sermon 11, SDT*, 63–64; *Sermo 15, SDT*, 71; *Sermo 43, SDT*, 94–95; *Sermo 39, SDT*, 92; *Sermo 45, SDT*, 95–96; *Sermo 50, SDT*, 101–102; *Sermo 65, SDT*, 116–117; *Sermo 83, SDT*, 137–138; *Sermo 111, SDT*, 170–173; *Sermo 112, SDT*, 173–174; *Sermo 126, SDT*, 187–188; *Sermo 139, SDT*, 202; *Sermo 142, SDT*, 205–207.

[164] *Sermo 167, SDT*, 235–236; *Sermo 173, SDT*, 240–241; *Sermo 180, SDT*, 248; *Sermo 181, SDT*, 248–249; *Sermo 186, SDT*, 253–255; *Sermo 189, SDT*, 258–259; *Sermo 207, SDT*, 284.

[165] *Sermo 207, SDT*, 284

[166] Franchi, *Il concilio*, 76.

[167] Franchi, *Il concilio*, 82 and n. 27.

> Brother Bonaventure of glorious memory, bishop of Albano died in the same year and month in the early morning hours of Sunday the 15th. He was a man of knowledge and distinguished eloquence, illustrious in holiness, life, conduct and customs. Loved by God and men, he was good, affable, pious, merciful, and full of virtue. He was buried that Sunday in the church of the Friars Minor of Lyons. The Lord Pope was present at the rites together with all the cardinals, almost all the prelates of the Council and the entire curia. The Dominican friar, Pietro di Tarantasia, formerly the archbishop of Lyons and now the cardinal bishop of Ostia, celebrated the mass and preached on the theme from *The Second Book of Kings*, "I cry for you, my brother Jonathan." [1:26]. There were many tears and anguished sighs. God had given him, in fact, such a singular grace that whoever met him was moved by a heartfelt love for him.[168]

Capturing the atmosphere of the moment and the enduring legacy of Bonaventure, the *Ordinatio* mentions his eloquence and holiness, and makes a special note of the funeral sermon that was preached by a fellow mendicant. In protheme after protheme, the Seraphic Doctor stressed personal sanctity as an irreplaceable component of effective preaching, and confessed that the poverty of his sins kept him far from such an ideal.[169] Whatever truth may lie behind Bonaventure's self-portrait of the preacher as pauper, the recollections of the council reporter tell the story of a man whose presence confirmed for many the veracity of the love he proclaimed.

---

[168] Franchi, *Il Concilio*, 95.

[169] *Sermo 79, SDT*, 132; *Sermo 8, SDD 1*, 147; *Sermo 17, SDD 1*, 261; *Sermo 48, SDD 2*, 630; *Sermo 54, SDD 2*, 702; *Sermo 11, SDM*, 205; *Sermo 17, SDM*, 253; and *Sermo 48, SDM*, 459.

THE *LEGENDA MINOR*

Timothy J. Johnson

If the adjective "minor" connotes a sense of inferiority or a relative lack of importance, Bonaventure's *Legenda minor* surely confirms this appellation—at least according to most studies dedicated to the Seraphic Doctor's literary opus. The neglect of the *Legenda minor* in favor of Bonaventure's *Legenda maior* is evident in the paucity of studies dedicated to this liturgical text, and for that matter, to any Minorite choir legends.[1] While displaying little sustained interest in the *Legenda minor*, scholars are unanimous in following the Quaracchi editors[2] and ascribing this choir legend to Bonaventure of Bagnoregio. The critical text, which comprises sixty-three readings equally divided according to the Octave of the Feast of St Francis, is found in vol. 10 of the *Analecta Francesca.*[3] The widespread diffusion of the *Legenda minor* is striking, but not surprising given the canonical status of the text within the liturgical life of the brothers after the declaration in Paris of the General Chapter in 1266 mandated the destruction of earlier legends. As the Quaracchi editors noted, the earlier attempt in 1898 to collate manuscripts with the *Legenda minor* numbered forty-three codices,

---

[1] This essay, in part, is based on the following earlier studies: Timothy J. Johnson, "Prolegomena to the Study of Bonaventure's *Legenda minor*," *Frate Francesco* 76/1 (2010): 225–239; idem, "Introduction," in *La Légende mineure de François d'Assise*, trans. Armelle Le Huërou, in *François d'Assise. Écrits, Vies et témoignages*, ed. Jacques Dalarun (Paris: 2010), 2141–2151; idem, "Wonders in Stone and Space: The Theological Dimensions of the Miracle Narrative in Thomas of Celano and Bonaventure of Bagnoregio," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 71–90; idem, "Into the Light: Bonaventure's *Minor Legend of Saint Francis* and the Franciscan Production of Space," in *History, Hagiography, and Hermeneutics in Francis of Assisi*, ed. Jay Hammond, (New York: 2004), 229–249; idem, "Lost in Sacred Space: Textual Hermeneutics, Liturgical Worship, and Celano's *Legenda ad usum chori*," *Franciscan Studies* 59 (2001): 109–131. On Franciscan choir legends, see Jacques Dalarun, *Vers une résolution de la question franciscaine: La Légende ombrienne de Thomas de Celano* (Paris: 2007); Francesco Dolciami, "Francesco d'Assisi: tra devozione, culto, e liturgia," in *Collectanea Francescana* 71 (2001): 5–45; Felice Accrocca, "La straordinaria fecondità della sterile: la *Legenda minor* di Bonaventura," *Frate Francesco* 75 (2009): 179–211.

[2] Prologomena, c. 2, n. 13: *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia* (10 vols., Quaracchi: 1882–1902), vol. 8, xcii, and Praefatio in *Legendae S. Francisci Assisiensis Saeculis XIII et XIV Conscriptae ad Codicum Fidem Recensitae a Partibus Collegii*, (Analecta Franciscana) 10 (Quaracchi: 1895–1941), lxxi–lxxiii.

[3] *Legenda minor* in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 655–678. The preceding edition supplanted the *Legenda minor* in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 8, 565a–579b.

but the number could have easily been tripled if Minorite breviaries in various libraries had been included.[4] A study of such breviaries in the Apostolic Vatican library alone underscores the centrality of this *legenda* in the liturgical life of Franciscans. Not only was the *Legenda minor* utilized for the Octave and Feast of St Francis, but also occasionally for the Feast of the Stigmata.[5]

This essay, first of all, examines the *Legenda minor* as Bonaventure's attempt as minister general to construct the identity of his confreres by reworking the institutional memory of the Poverello through the spatial-theological genre proper to choir *legendae*. Miracles stories are afforded special attention since they illustrate how Bonaventure removed Francis from the category of local thaumaturge and reformulated his memory as that of a universal miracle, accessible to all through contemplation and transferable, so to speak, to any locale. The second section explores the performative nature of the *Legenda minor* as a liturgical text and the architectural context of Bonaventure's writing by emphasizing the theological significance of light in choir prayer. The final section of this essay takes up selected questions revolving around the date of Bonaventure's liturgical legend, which is typically assigned by scholars simply in relation to the presumed earlier date of the *Legenda maior*.

The *Legenda minor* and Franciscan Identity

Choir legends like the *Legenda minor* are primarily conceived, composed, and received as spatial-theological texts, ritually performed in a designated sacred space and season. The ritual context is the Liturgy of the Hours, where those gathered in prayer enter into a dialogical exchange with the divine interlocutor in the paradox of the paschal mystery.[6] Choir *vitae* function as unique witnesses to a specific communal memory of a saint, whose life of virtue and miraculous deeds are recounted within the dynamics of liturgical prayer and the dominant cultic-cultural identity of the institution in question. Given their essential status within worship, these particular hagiographical texts take on a level of iconicity that is

---

[4] Praefatio, *Legendae S. Francisci*, lxxvii.

[5] Dalarun, *Vers une résolution*, 321–323.

[6] Augustinus Hollaardt, "Die Feier des Stundengebetes und das Pascha-Mysterium," in *Lebendiges Stundengebet: Vertiefung und Hilfe*, ed. Martin Klöckner and Heinrich Rennings (Freiburg: 1989), 40–147.

not shared by non-liturgical documents.[7] Intended more specifically for communal contemplation than for the promulgation of the saint's cult throughout the universal church, choir legends recount through ritual narratives the stories of the saints whose power and authority construct and confirm identity.[8] Their privileged place in the religious community was underscored by the preaching that accompanied them.[9] Since hagiographical texts offer models to be emulated,[10] and the performative dimension of liturgical prayer offers a ritual context for the transformation for those at prayer, the choice of choir legend was decisive in the formation of Franciscan identity.

The need for a new image of Francis of Assisi that would represent the order's self-understanding in the 1250s and 1260s, and serve as the transformative instructional paradigm in choir, induced Bonaventure and other second-generation friars to suppress the *Legenda ad usum chori*, along with Celano's *Vita prima* and any other legends—liturgical or otherwise—in circulation, and construct a performative identity for Minorites with his *Legenda minor*. As a choir legend, the *Legenda minor* was not composed to promulgate the cult of St Francis throughout the universal church, but for ritual celebration and the construction of identity within a designated sacred space of the ecclesial choir. Indeed, rubrics from extant manuscripts prescribed this legend for inclusion in choir books such as the sanctorales and portable breviaries.[11] By composing the *Legenda minor* for his confreres, Bonaventure presented a "prayed Francis" whom the

---

[7] Thomas J. Heffernan, *Sacred Biography: Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages* (New York: 1988), 36–37.

[8] On hagiographical legends, liturgical celebrations, and identity, see Susan Boynton, *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy & History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125* (Ithaca: 2006), esp. 65–80; 184–185; 208.

[9] Sermons typically came after the third set of readings in the Office of Matins before the Gospel was read, according to Martin Morard, "Quand Liturgie 'Épousa' Prédication," in *Prédication et liturgie au Moyen Age*, ed. Nicole Bériou and Franco Morenzoni (Turnhout: 2008), 117. In Sermo 58, in *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones de diversis*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol, vol. 2 (Paris: 1993), 773, Bonaventure may be referring to the *Legenda minor*. The reading would have been *Legenda minor* in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.8, 657–658. The reference may have also been to a sermon on the *Legenda minor* from earlier in the day; see Timothy J. Johnson, "La preghiera corale come luogo di formazione e definizione dell'identità religiosa: l'esempio dell'Ordo Minorum," trans. Daniele Sini, in *Religiosità e civiltà. Identità delle forme religiose (secoli X–XIV)* (Milan: 2011), 243–255.

[10] For example, see David of Augsburg, *De exterioris et interioris hominis compositione* (Quaracchi: 1899), c. 13, n. 1, 16–17.

[11] Jacques Dalarun, "Comment détruire les légendes franciscaines? Une ingénieuse application de la définition de 1266 dans le manuscrit *Reg. lat.* 1738 de la Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana," *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*, vol. 14, 219–220.

brothers encountered in the contemplative performance of the Liturgical Hours.[12] Through liturgical prayer, the memory of the saint functioned as the mediator of identity which was internalized through reading, responsorial psalms, and silent meditation in accord with the admonition, "Do this in memory of me," in the Eucharistic celebration. This transformative power of liturgical hagiography in sacred space, which is essentially contested space,[13] offers insight into the origin of the *Legenda minor*.

When a salient segment of a religious community no longer promotes the prevailing "prayed" likeness of their founder, a new image may be constructed, and the previous choir legend may be supplanted or even suppressed by another legend that reflects the prevailing institutional-theological identity. There is evidence of this process among Dominicans and Franciscans in the 1250s, when Humbert of Romans undertook to write a new liturgical *vita* of St Dominic at the request of the 1254 chapter of Preachers,[14] and the Minorite chapter of 1254 or 1257 called for a new legend of St Francis.[15] Both requests reflected a shifting interpretation of their respective founders and the perceived need for a "prayed" image in conformity with the established communal identity of the 1250s. The composition of the *Legenda ad usum chori* composed perhaps around 1230 by Thomas of Celano or Julian of Speyer, the refusal of the minister general Haymo of Faversham to identity a liturgical legend for the Minorite *Ordinals* in the early 1240s,[16] the proliferation of *vitae* of Francis, and the introduction of the *Legenda minor* as the canonical choir legend in 1266 testify to the crucial, contested nature of the "prayed Francis" among Franciscans between the 1230s and the 1260s. The call for a new liturgical *legenda* as

---

[12] On liturgy and performance, see Richard D. McCall, *Do This: Liturgy as Performance*, (Notre Dame: 2007). See also Joyce Ann Zimmerman, *Liturgy and Hermeneutics* (Collegeville: 1999), 18–20, and Bridget Nichols, *Liturgical Hermeneutics: Interpreting Liturgical Rites in Performance* (New York: 1996), 9.

[13] Philip Sheldrake, *Spaces for the Sacred: Place, Memory and Identity* (Baltimore: 2001), 5.

[14] Edward Tracy Brett, *Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* (Toronto: 1984), 93.

[15] Hieronymus Golubovich, "Ceremoniale Ord. Minorum vetustissimum seu 'Ordinationes divini Offici'," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 76, n. 3.

[16] Stephen Van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Liturgy* (Westminster, Md.: 1960), 381. On the possibility of Julian of Speyer as the author of the *Legenda ad usum chori*, see Filippo Seda, "La Legenda ad usum chori e il codice assisano 338," *Franciscana* 12 (2010): 43–83, and idem and E. Rava, "Sulle tracce dell'autore della Legenda ad usum chori. Analisi lessicografica e ipotesi di attribuzione," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 69 (2011): 77–140. Filippo Seda has also brought to light a Minorite choir legend that adheres to the liturgical guidelines of the 1240s; see "La legenda liturgica Vaticana per l'ottava di san Francesco: Franciscus alter Evangelista," *Frate Francesco* 78 (2012): 83–126.

early as the Chapter of Genoa in 1254 and the edict of the Paris Chapter of 1266 to destroy the earlier *vitae* confirmed the renunciation of the earlier portrait of the Poverello by those who understood the transformative power of liturgical prayer and desired to construct a new Minorite identity around a different memory.

The memory of Francis in the *Legenda minor* is distinct from both the earlier *Legenda ad usum chori* and Bonaventure's own *Legenda maior*. This is particularly evident in the treatment of the thaumaturgical actions of the Poverello. Adhering to the structure of celebration during the Matins Office of the Octave, the minister general proposed seven series of readings: I. His Conversion II. Institution of Religion and the Efficacy of Preaching III. Prerogatives of the Virtues IV. Zeal for Prayer and the Spirit of Prophecy V. Obedience of Creatures and Divine Condescension VI. Sacred Stigmata and VII. Passage of Death. While five of nine lessons of the *Legenda ad usum chori* speak of miraculous healings, only seven of sixty-three lessons in the *Legenda minor* recounted incidents of people being cured from sickness.[17] The numerical disparity between the two *legendae* is immediately evident, as are the differing theological agendas. When concluding the *Legenda minor*, Bonaventure did not mention the miracles of Francis among the seven testimonies to the Poverello's holiness,[18] whereas the *Legenda ad usum chori* emphasized them. Nevertheless, Bonaventure displayed a concern with the liturgical context of the choir legends by providing two, albeit dissimilar accounts of healings linked to bread and wine. In the first instance, Francis took bread crumbs, mixed them with oil taken from a lamp before the altar of the Virgin, thereby confecting a medicinal pill for a sick religious lying in a hospital outside of Assisi. Not only was the sick man healed, he became one of the Lesser Brothers, and never again ate cooked food or drank wine.[19] In the second instance, Francis, who was seriously ill at the hermitage of St Urban, changed water into excellent wine, thus providing a most efficacious, and undoubtedly tasty medicinal tonic.[20] These stories evince Bonaventure's theological perspective in the *Commentaria in quatuor*

[17] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 2.7, 661; 4.8, 668; 5.2, 669; 6.7, 674; 6.8, 675; 7.7, 677–678; 7.8, 678.
[18] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 7.9, 678.
[19] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 2.7, 661.
[20] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 5.2, 669.

libros sententiarum, whereby the sacraments are the sweet confections of the druggist, perfect for healing body and soul.[21]

Both writers, the author of the *Legenda ad usum chori* and Bonaventure, were intent on constructing their confreres' ecclesial identity in choir, but the minister general conspicuously avoided linking the "prayed Francis" to papal power, canonization, and miracles at the Poverello's tomb. As Bonaventure noted in the *Regula novitiorum*, choir prayer promotes the paradoxical passage from darkness to light,[22] that is, from death to new life. The *Legenda minor* was composed with this liturgical-theological framework in mind; the opening chapter recounts how the Father of mercy and light guided Francis as a young man from darkness to light.[23] Subsequently, the liturgical imperative, "Do this in memory of me," finds a surprising performative-theological impetus in Bonaventure's own experience. In the final chapter, he confessed that when he was seriously ill as a child, his mother made a vow to St Francis. Bonaventure thus escaped death and was restored to life by the saint's miraculous intercession.[24] Such an appeal to personal experience as an epistemological principle of theology is noteworthy, and is also found in the *Itinerarium in mentis Deum*[25] and the *Sermones dominicales*.[26] These accounts, where memory serves as the matrix for theological reflection, are intertwined with the paschal mystery, and in particular, the cross and/or the stigmata. Indeed, two of the three extended healing narratives in the *Legenda minor* are viewed through the interpretive lens of the stigmata,[27] which organizes the text, together with other mysteries of the cross, from the opening lesson to the conclusion.[28]

Bonaventure's new liturgical reading of Francis of Assisi created a performative memory of the founder eminently suited to the realities of the Minorite Order. In sharp distinction to the earlier *Legenda ad usum chori*, no emphasis was placed on the canonization and burial of the Poverello in Assisi. The *Legenda minor* shifted the attention of the brothers away from

---

[21] *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum*, prooem. (4, 1a–3b).

[22] Bonaventure, *Regula novitiorum*, praefatiuncula (8, 475a).

[23] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1, 655.

[24] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 7.8, 678. Bonaventure's memory of this incident here is far more intimate than the account he offers in the *Legenda maior*, see *Leg. maj.* prol. 3, (8, 558).

[25] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology* (Chicago: 1978), 305.

[26] *Sermo 40*, n. 4, *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones dominicales*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Grottaferrata: 1977), 407.

[27] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 6.7, 674, and 6.8, 675.

[28] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1, 655, and 7.9, 678.

this historical locus of miracles and ministry in exchange for a peripatetic memory of a miraculous, stigmatized body constructed in the liturgical performance and harmonized with the institutional paradigm of Franciscan identity. As a result, Francis was not a miracle worker to be simply admired, but a miracle to be contemplated in worship and imitated in life through the practice of the virtues. Minorite identity was initiated by an encounter with the miracle of Francis, an event that is ever-present in the memory of the community through prayer and as "portable" as the breviaries carried by Bonaventure's confreres throughout Europe and beyond. The practice of identity extended beyond the choir into the world and returned to the choir as the brothers imitated the Christ-like virtues of Francis.[29]

The *Legenda minor* and Gothic Choir Performance

The study of the *Legenda minor* as a major liturgical text for choir, which was neither conceived nor composed as a truncated *Legenda maior*, but rather as a distinctive hagiographical genre, leads to an exploration of the possible role of architecture in mediating the composition and performance of this spatial-theological text.[30] Both the original context and the unique content of the *Legenda minor* suggest that Bonaventure cultivated the liturgical remembrance of Francis within the context of the prevailing Gothic architecture of the newly constructed urban churches under the auspices of Minorite communities in Paris and elsewhere.

Paris, where Bonaventure had studied with the Faculty of Arts in 1235 and entered the Franciscans in 1243, remained his religious, academic, and legislative point of reference until his death in 1274 at the Council of Lyon. A primary locus of his liturgical life was the choir of the Minorite church of Ste-Madeleine. The Lesser Brothers began the construction of the church named after Mary Magdalene, the patroness of their religious province, as early as 1236. Alexander of Hales moved his chair of theology there in 1245. At the time of the consecration in 1262, Ste-Madeleine measured over 90 meters long, with the majority of space dedicated to the choir area. In appearance and function, Bonaventure's church seemed like

---

[29] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 6.9, 675. On this text, the virtues, and liturgical worship, see: *FAED* 2, 712, n. a.

[30] On architecture, mediation, and sacred space, see Thomas Barrie, *The Sacred In-Between: The Mediating Roles of Architecture* (London: 2010).

two different churches, one for the laity and the other for the brothers. The variegated Gothic influence, prevalent throughout the city, was evident in Ste-Madeleine.[31]

Bonaventure's celebration of Matins during the Octave of the Feast of St Francis in Ste-Madeleine, together with other liturgical experiences throughout the Paris environs[32] and in numerous Minorite churches during his travels as minister general, appears to be mirrored in the structure and content of the *Legenda minor*. The theological elements of Gothic architecture, such as light and order,[33] linked as they are to the ascending-descending nature of the contemplative-active synthesis, are interrelated aspects of the Franciscan construction of identity in choir. Indeed, they make their appearance at the outset of the *Legenda minor*.[34] This pronounced emphasis on light, and the visual dynamic of perception, is notably absent from the prologue of the *Legenda maior*. These initial lines of the *Legenda minor* are already a sufficient reason to view this finely crafted hagiographical-liturgical *legenda* as far more than an abbreviated version of the *Legenda maior*. Bonaventure's predilection for light as the preferred metaphor for grace, especially in the context of prayer, is evident throughout his writings.[35] The light of grace illuminates, reforms, refreshes, and enlivens as it descends from the Father of lights and leads

---

[31] Wolfgang Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden: Baukunst der Dominikaner und Franziskaner in Europa* (Darmstadt: 2000), 71–72 and idem, *Ordines studentes: Aspekte zur Kirchenarchitektur der Dominikaner und Franziskaner im 13. Jh.* (Berlin 1985), 76–84, esp. 83. Schenkluhn notes that Ste-Madeleine was a unique combination of Cathedral Gothic elements without certain aspects common to High Gothic. While the church was not constructed in High Gothic, Schenkluhn does leave open the possibility that the choir area was of such a design. Corrado Bozzoni maintains that, in general, the mendicants in the area of Paris were more open to the influence of High Gothic: Corrado Bozzoni, "L'edilizia mendicante in Europa," in *Lo spazio dell'umiltà: Atti del convegno di studi sull'edilizia dell'ordine dei minori* (Fara Sabina: 1984), 291. On the development of Gothic architecture in Paris, see: *L'abbé Suger, le manifeste gothique de Saint-Denis et la pensée victorine*, ed. Dominique Poirel (Turnhout: 2001), esp. Patrice Sicard, "L'urbanisme de la Cité de Dieu: constructions et architectures dans la pensée théologique du XII^{e} siècle," 109–140. On Ste-Madeleine, see also Michael Davis, " 'Fitting to the Requirements of the Place': The Franciscan Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine in Paris," in *Architecture, Liturgy and Identity*, eds. Achim Timmermann and Zoe Opacic (Turnhout: 2011), 247–261.

[32] Bonaventure's sensitivity to the symbolism of light in a morning liturgical setting is displayed in Sermo 44 in *Sermones de diversis*, vol. 2, 580.

[33] Sheldrake, *Spaces for the Sacred*, 53.

[34] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1, 655.

[35] Timothy J. Johnson, *The Soul in Ascent: Bonaventure on Poverty, Prayer, and Union with God* (St Bonaventure: 2012), 81–84.

those who pray upward in the return to the fontal source.[36] This divine light, which illuminates and transforms, conforms and orientates those who pray to Christ through the virtues that are so prominent in the *Legenda minor*.[37]

The thematic of light is particularly applicable to performative celebration of Matins for the Octave of St Francis, since this ancient form of vigil begins in the darkness of night, yet awaits the promised light of dawn.[38] The first chapter of the *Legenda minor* thus begins with theological imagery corresponding to the highly suggestive, ascending-descending ordered lines of Gothic choir architecture, emphasizing and contrasting both the darkness and light of the choir and the ordering of body and soul for the journey into God. As the brothers anticipated and participated in the movement from darkness to light in this initial encounter with their founder, they were introduced into the transformative dynamic of conversion that freed Francis to exchange the business of the world for service to the poor, crucified Christ.[39] At the end of the first chapter—and the first and eighth morning of the octave—Bonaventure's confreres found themselves in choir ruminating on the condition of the universal church reflected in the once abandoned local churches of San Damiano, Saint Peter, and Mary of the Angels.[40] Just as the early morning environment of the choir proffered the imagery of conversion, so too did the simple, neglected churches dear to Francis. These sacred spaces announced the necessity of emulating the example of the "prayed Francis," who discovered that churches mediated the presence of the divine in prayer and

---

[36] The scriptural reference is to Jas. 1:17, one of the most frequently quoted biblical texts in Bonaventure's works, which appears 48 times in the *Opera Omnia*. See Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: 1988), 220. For Bonaventure's theological use of the light theme with reference to the return or *reductio*, see *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, ed. Zachary Hayes in *Works of Saint Bonaventure*, vol. 1 (Saint Bonaventure: 1996).

[37] The virtues are emphasized in 3.1–9; 6, 9; and 7.9. The christological dimensions of the virtues appear as early as Bonaventure's Parisian *Commentary on the Sentences*; see *III Sent*, d. 34. p. 1. a. 1, q. 1, concl. (3, 737a). The numerical pattern of their appearance in the *Legenda minor* underscores the *reductio* dynamic of the choir *legenda* and the agency of Gothic choir architecture.

[38] The thematic of light and darkness in the monastic Divine Office is treated in: Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings* (Turnhout: 2001), 96–100. On Matins in the medieval period, see John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: 1991), 86–97. In regard to the Octave of St Francis, see Dolciami, "Francesco d'Assisi," 39–44.

[39] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1–2, 655.

[40] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.9, 658.

evoked a longing for renewal. For Bonaventure and his confreres, the operative imperative of "Do this in memory of me" elicited a commitment to both contemplation and action within an urban setting in harmony with Minorite institutional identity as *viri spirituales* or spiritual men in the 1250s and 1260s.[41]

Ch. 2, which begins by recalling the evangelical mandate of the brothers at the church of Saint Mary of the Angels, together with chs. 3–6, employs light imagery to underscore the role of prayer. In the second chapter, Bonaventure adheres closely to Celano's earlier narrative when recounting how Francis, while praying at midnight, simultaneously appeared at the entrance to the dwelling place of the brothers in a dazzling chariot. As he was transfigured in their presence, both those who had been sleeping and those who had been praying were immersed in a powerful light and convinced that their founder was the proven leader of spiritual men.[42] When warned in ch. 3 that his continual weeping would result in the loss of his eyesight, Francis dismissed the doctor's advice because he preferred the brilliance of celestial light that raised him upward into God.[43] The light-drenched body of Francis, elevated in the darkness of night as he prayed in solitary places and abandoned churches, is detailed in ch. 4. The entire scene is symbolic of the divine light that elevated his soul.[44] Reference to prayer in the darkness and the appearance of light in chs. 2, 3, and 4 is suggestive of the early morning celebration of Matins, and the thematic is further developed in chapters five and six. Darkness and light appear most intensely, paradoxically together, in the fifth chapter within a travel narrative, where a companion of Francis insisted he pray for assistance in the darkness;[45] they provide a compelling theological link, not found in the *Legenda maior*, to the sixth chapter on the stigmata. Here in the morning light on Mount Alverna and in the Octave liturgy in his memory, Francis, the apocalyptic angel of the sixth seal,[46] is lifted up

---

[41] On Bonaventure's conception of *viri spirituales*, see Bonaventure, *Sunday Sermons*, ed. and trans. Timothy J. Johnson (Saint Bonaventure: 2008), 31–34, and Jay Hammond, "Contemplation and the Formation of the vir spiritualis in Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaemeron*," in *Franciscans at Prayer*, ed. T.J. Johnson (Leiden: 2007), 123–165.

[42] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1, 655.

[43] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1, 655.

[44] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 1.1, 655.

[45] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 5.8–9, 671–672. On the apparent paradox of light and darkness in Bonaventure's theology of prayer, see Johnson, *Soul in Ascent*, 167–168.

[46] *Legenda minor* in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 7.1, 675. The image of the stigmatized angel of the Apocalypse can be seen in the choir area of the Lower Basilica of Saint Francis in Assisi.

into God through contemplation and transformed by fiery love into the image of the Crucified, who descends in the guise of a glittering, fiery, six-winged Seraph.[47]

The seventh chapter of the *Legenda minor* continues the ascending-descending theme with the return of Francis down from Mount Alverna. Transfixed in body, he was likewise transfixed in spirit and longed to set the hearts of others aflame with the divine fire he encountered.[48] This descent from the mountain into ministry was simultaneously an ascent, as divine and human loves were melded in the stigmatized flesh of the Poverello. Just as he was continually lifted up into the divine light, Francis desired to return to lowly origins. The themes of preaching and compassion, integral aspects of the Minorite production of sacred space through the medium of choir frescoes,[49] were proclaimed in the seventh chapter, on the seventh day of the Octave of Saint Francis. This seventh day is not the final day, for the cycle of Matins included the eighth day, when the *legenda* readings from the first day commenced anew. This day, according to Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, brought body and soul back to the beginning, transformed by the passage.[50] As the desired dawn drew nearer, the *Legenda minor* returned the brothers into the darkness from which their founder emerged, with the enduring promise of the divine light that descends from above. This is the light into which Francis ascended at his death;[51] it is the same light into which the "prayed Francis" led his brothers through the mediation of Bonaventure's performative text and the evocative agency of their Gothic choirs.

Context and Date of the *Legenda minor*

With regard to the date for the composition of the *Legenda minor*, most scholars follow the timeline of Jacques Guy Bougerol,[52] who suggested a period between 1260 and 1263. Their position often assumes the customary,

---

[47] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 6.1–4, 672–673.

[48] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 7.1, 675–676.

[49] Klaus Krüger, "Un santo da guardare: l'immagine di san Francesco nelle tavole del Duecento," in *Francesco d'Assisi el il primo secolo di storia francescana*, ed. Attilio Langeli and Emanuel a Prinzivalli (Turin: 1997), 152–161, and Dieter Blume, *Wandmalerei als Ordenspropaganda: Bildprogramme im Chorbereich Franziskanischer Konvente Italiens bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Worms: 1983), 10–13; 20–21; 107.

[50] *Hex.*, 3.31 (5, 348b).

[51] *Leg. min.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 7.5, 677.

[52] Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Francesco e Bonaventura* (Vicenza: 1984), 18–20.

albeit problematic, dating of the *Legenda maior* and a corresponding, a priori belief that the *Legenda minor* is a summary of the *Legenda maior*. There are those, however, who have taken exception to this position. Damien Vorreux suggested a composition date for the *Legenda minor* as early as 1257, since he considered it to be Bonaventure's response to the expressed wishes of the 1257 Rome chapter, where he was elected minister general.[53] Jacques Cambell claimed the liturgical *vita* appeared as late as 1268, well after the acceptance of the *Legenda maior* during the 1266 chapter in Paris and before Bonaventure's departure from Paris in the winter of 1268.[54] Felice Accrocca also accepted the premise that the *Legenda minor* is posterior to the *Legenda maior*, which he holds was presented to the 1263 chapter in Pisa, and posited the later 1260s as the date for the composition of Bonaventure's liturgical legend.[55]

Once the problematic dating of the *Legenda maior* is recognized,[56] Minorite liturgical legislation in the 1250s provides external criteria favorable to dating the *Legenda minor* before or around 1260. Already in Haymo of Faversham's *Ordo breviarii* from 1243–1244, there is a curious blank instead of a specific choir legend for the Feast of St Francis.[57] As early as 1254, the Minorite Chapter in Genoa requested a new legend of Francis among the rubrics on liturgical practice promoted by the then minister general, John of Parma. His personal piety, dedication to liturgy, and concern for the proper behavior of his brothers in choir were well known among his confreres.[58] In John's *Ceremoniale Ord. Minorum Vetustissimum* the following is found: "Likewise, with regard to the legend of blessed Francis, it is so ordered that one good one be compiled from all of them."[59] The editor of this text, Hieronymus Golubovich, noted that this rubric refers to the need for a new liturgical legend, since several were in use

---

[53] Théophile Desbonnets and Damien Vorreux, *Saint François d'Assise. Documents, écrits et premières biographies* (Paris: 1968), 1468.

[54] Jacques Cambell, "Une tentative de résoudre la question franciscaine," *Miscellanea Francescana* 69 (1962): p. 203.

[55] Accrocca, "La straordinaria fecondità," 210.

[56] On the problematic nature of the customary dating of the *Legenda maior*, see Jacques Dalarun, *La Malaventura di Francesco d'Assisi* (Milan: 1996), 160–161. On the question of dating, see also Dolciami, "Francesco d'Assisi," 25–29.

[57] S.J.P. Van Dijk, *Sources for the Modern Roman Liturgy*, vol. 2 (Leiden: 1963), 165. See also vol. 1, 84.

[58] Rosalind B. Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government* (Cambridge: 1959), 263.

[59] "Item ordinetur de legenda beati Francisci, ut de omnibus una bona compiletur," in Golubovich, "Ceremoniale," 76, n. 74.

among the brothers.[60] Acceptance of the 1254 date is not unanimous, and some scholars note that both the chapters of 1257 in Rome and the 1260 chapter in Narbonne are other possibilities for the origin of this rubric. The 1257 date was advanced by Ferdinand Delorme,[61] and 1260 by the Quaracchi editors.[62] Regardless of the year, Fernando Uribe maintained that the rubric in question concerned a liturgical choir legend.[63]

If 1260 is the correct date for the liturgical rubric, the immediate question arises as to why it did not appear in the *Diffinitiones* from the Narbonne chapter.[64] More importantly, why would the Minorites not follow the example of their fellow mendicants, the Order of Preachers? Interest in choir legends was by no means limited to the Franciscans, as the intensive liturgical reform of the Dominicans in the 1250s reveals. Humbert of Romans's attempt to write a new liturgical *vita* of St Dominic at the request of the 1254 chapter of Preachers culminated in an official legend for choir approved by the Dominican chapter in 1256.[65] This text[66] was divided into individual lessons for the octave liturgy just like the *Legenda minor*, and included nine lessons, similar in structure to ch. 15 of the *Legenda maior*, which were intended for the choir celebration of the translation of Dominic's miraculous corpse.[67] John of Parma's liturgical directives mirrored the Preachers', with whom he cultivated a fraternal institutional relationship.[68] It is plausible, then, that the minister general of the Franciscans pushed for a single liturgical *vita* as early as 1254. Even if the chapter of Genoa preceded the rubric, 1257 appears more likely than 1260, given the efforts of the Preachers and corresponding Minorite liturgical legislation that emulated their mendicant counterparts throughout the 1250s. Since the Dominicans rewrote the choir legend of their founder for the octave celebration and the translation of his body, it is entirely feasible to argue that

---

[60] Golubovich, "Ceremoniale," 76, n. 3.

[61] Ferdinand Delorme, "Diffinitiones Capituli Generalis O.F.M. Narbonensis (1260)," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 492, n. 1. This view is also held by Van Dijk, *Sources*, vol. 2, 417, n. 3.

[62] *Praefatio, Legendae S. Francisci*, lxiii, n. 1.

[63] Fernando Uribe, *Introducción a las hagiografías de San Francesco y Santa Clara de Asís (siglos xiii–xiv)* (Murica: 1999), 233.

[64] Delorme, "Diffinitiones," 502–504.

[65] Angelus Waltz, "Einführung," in Humbert of Romans, *Legenda sancti dominici auctore Humberto de Romanis*, ed. Angelus Waltz (Monumenta historica sancti patris nostri dominici) 16 (Rome: 1935), 358. See also Edward Tracy Brett, *Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* (Toronto: 1984), 93.

[66] *Legenda sancti dominici*, 369–423.

[67] *In translatione beati Dominici* in *Legenda sancti dominici*, 424–428.

[68] Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government*, 263, and Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, 4–30.

Bonaventure, who was elected in the Roman chapter of 1257, responded to the desire of the capitulars and followed Humbert of Romans, as he was inclined to do.[69] Such an initial claim goes hand in hand with an early dating of ch. 15 of the *Legenda maior*. The transferal of the miraculous body of Francis to his cryptal basilica was a Minorite feast from the time of Haymo of Faversham's reform in the 1240s.[70] This event was found in the *Legenda umbra* of Celano,[71] the impetus for the choir readings was taken from Celano's *Vita secunda S. Francisci*,[72] and was noted in the fifteenth chapter of the *Legenda maior*.[73] If ch. 15 of the *Legenda maior* was written by Bonaventure before the rest of that same *vita*,[74] it is conceivable that the *Legenda minor* was the newly elected minister general's response to the 1257 request for a new choir legend for the octave of St Francis and, similar to the material of chapter fifteen that was intended for the Feast of the Transferal, was composed prior to the *Legenda maior*. With the *Legenda minor* and nine lessons for the Feast of the Transferal completed, Bonaventure expanded and collated this material for the *Legenda maior* and deleted all other legends, liturgical or otherwise, through the controversial declaration of the Paris chapter in 1266.[75] Given the liturgical legislation of the Preachers and the Minorites and their corresponding desire to promulgate a new institutional paradigm of their founders, it is extremely difficult to hold that the *Legenda minor* originated between

---

[69] Saint Bonaventure, *Writings Concerning the Franciscan Order*, intro. and trans. Dominic Monti (Saint Bonaventure: 1994), 29, n. 79. It is worth pointing out that a Dominican *vita* of Francis appeared in the mid-1250s. See Waltz, "Einführung," 363; and for the text, see *Testimonia minori saeculi xiii*, ed. Leonardus Lemmens (Quaracchi: 1926), 57–59. On the celebration of Dominic in the liturgy of the Preachers, see *Le sanctoral du lectionnaire de l'office dominicain, 1254–1256, édition et étude d'après le ms Rome, Sainte-Sabine XIV L1*, "*Ecclesiasticum officium secundum ordinem fratrum praedicatorum*," ed. Anne Élisabeth Urfels-Capot (Mémoires et documents de l'École des chartes) 84 (Paris: 2007), 82–85, 294–295. On early Dominican hagiography, see Agnès Dubreil-Arcin, *Vies de saints, légendes de soi: L'écriture hagiographique dominicaine jusqu'au Speculum sanctorale de Bernard Gui († 1331)* (Turnhout: 2011).

[70] Van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker, *Origins*, 379.

[71] Dalarun, *Vers une résolution*, 272–273.

[72] Dalarun, *Vers une résolution*, 317.

[73] *Leg. Maj.*, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 14.8, 626.

[74] Théophile Desbonnets, "La diffusion du culte de saint François en France d'après les bréviaires manuscrits étrangers à l'Ordre," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 75 (1982): 212. It is noteworthy that ch. 15 of the *Legenda maior* is separated into nine possible lessons in the critical edition, reflecting the nine-fold structure of readings found in the *Legenda minor*. The only other chapter of the *Legenda maior* divided into nine possible readings is ch. 9.

[75] On this chapter decision, see Jacques Dalarun, "Comment détruire," 219–220.

1266 and 1268, that is to say, some twelve to fourteen years after Humbert of Romans reconstituted the "prayed Dominic" for his confreres in choir.

Internal criteria also point to the possibility of an earlier date. If the content of Bonaventure's *Legenda minor* is examined in comparison to the *Legenda ad usum chori*, claims for a later dating of the *Legenda minor* are often called into question. One obstacle that emerges at the outset is the assumption that the *Legenda minor* is subsequent to the *Legenda maior* and belongs to the same genre of hagiographical literature. This stance lends itself to a hermeneutic that compares and contrasts narrative segments in the life of Francis and, in some cases, concludes that the accounts in the *Legenda minor* must be later, since they are suspiciously different from similar stories in the *Legenda maior*.[76] That descriptions in the *Legenda minor* are brief and lack many of the details found in the *Legenda maior* is hardly alarming per se, since the rationale and genre of a choir legend require a focused, contemplative text to foster institutional identity, not nuanced narratives of the Poverello's life. As the story of Francis on the chariot demonstrated, the *Legenda minor* followed the brief account in the *Legenda ad usum chori* without mentioning that Francis was preaching in Assisi. In the *Legenda maior*, Bonaventure's editorial choice to situate Francis in this urban setting could be viewed as a significant, indeed radical redaction of the earlier biographies, which was meant to foster the institutional ministry of preaching in the 1260s.[77] Yet if the urban context was admittedly so crucial to Minorite identity, why did Bonaventure not mention it in the paradigmatic *Legenda minor*, which was performed in choir and accompanied by preaching during the Octave of Saint Francis? Instead of downplaying, altering or eliminating crucial aspects of the Francis narrative from the *Legenda maior*, it is entirely possible that Bonaventure fashioned his choir *vita* against the backdrop of existing choir legends in the late 1250s. This distinct possibility fosters a different methodology and set of conclusions.[78]

If, for example, the corresponding accounts of the Poverello's conversion are contrasted, the *Legenda minor* seems to present a pacified picture of the conversion process, which emphasized personal mystical experience, but lacked the pivotal encounter with the leper as well as the

---

[76] Accrocca, "La straordinaria fecondità," 179–211. For an example of this methodology in the comparative analysis of Celano and Bonaventure, see Giovanni Miccoli, *Francesco d'Assisi: Realtà e memoria di un'esperienza cristiana* (Turin: 1991), 65–302.

[77] Bonaventure, *Sunday Sermons*, 32.

[78] On this methodology and internal criteria, see Johnson, "Prolegomena," 225–239.

decision to associate with the poor.[79] That Bonaventure accentuated the mystical in a brief liturgical text intended for prayer is self-explanatory, but even more significant is that Celano or Speyer did something similar to Bonaventure with regard to the leper. The author of the *Legenda ad usum chori* did not recount the encounter with Francis and the leper, even though it was found in the earlier *Vita prima*, but he noted the care Francis manifested toward the lepers whom he previously despised, and how he wiped their sores and washed their bloody wounds.[80] When this account is read together with Bonaventure's account, it appears more likely that the minister general built on the choir text of Celano or Speyer instead of radically redacting a pre-existing *Legenda maior* for ideological-theological purposes. The brevity of the account and the corresponding emphasis on mysticism and personal experience suggest a date around 1259–1260 when Bonaventure composed other works like the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, the *De quinque festivitatibus*, and the *Soliloquium*. In this process, he may have even collaborated with his gifted Parisian confrere, Julian of Speyer, who had composed the *Vita S. Francisci*, the *Officium S. Francisci*, and perhaps the *Legenda ad usum chori.*

Conclusion

Emerging from the shadow of the *Legenda maior*, Bonaventure's *Legenda minor* displays a wondrous, illuminative image of the "prayed Francis" encountered in choir by his confreres and proper to the institutional-spiritual exigencies of the Franciscan order of the mid-1250s. As the seventh minister general, Bonaventure most likely responded to the capitulary request of 1257 for a new liturgical legend by composing a *vita* that reflected the crisp narrative approach already present in the earlier *Legenda ad usum chori*, but expanded for the entire Octave of Saint Francis and suited for the second-generation urban milieu of his confreres. Whereas members of the Minorite Order in the early 1230s constructed their identity through the common liturgical celebration of the canonized thaumaturge who was both born and buried in Assisi, Bonaventure introduced his brothers to the memory of the miraculous, stigmatized Saint, who is united with the Crucified Christ, and is universally present to them in the transformative performance of liturgical prayer. A newfound

[79] Accrocca, "La straordinaria fecondità," 186–187.
[80] *Legenda ad usum chori* 3, in *Legendae S. Francisci*, 120.

appreciation of his efforts in *Legenda minor* calls into question the long-standing neglect of other similar spatial-theological Franciscan texts. It is sobering to recollect that the eventual success of Bonaventure's extraordinary reformulation of institutional-spiritual identity was furthered by the widespread, systematic elimination of earlier, variegated choir legends. These texts—to the extent that they are still extant—need to be reexamined because they are indicative of different performances, and hence different memories, of the Poverello, which were likewise cherished in prayer and practiced in daily living. And finally, if the last is indeed the first (so to speak), and the *Legenda minor* preceded the previously privileged *Legenda maior*, then the reappraisal of the chronology, content and context of this choir *legenda* suggests it may be time for a similar effort from scholars of the *Legenda maior*.

BONAVENTURE'S *LEGENDA MAJOR*

Jay M. Hammond

Approximately thirty years after Francis' death, and after a litany of intervening writings about the saint,[1] Bonaventure's brothers asked him to write a new life of St Francis.[2] In 1261, Bonaventure finished the request. Later, the 1266 Chapter of Paris made it the definitive life of St Francis. This essay will argue that the *Legenda major*'s structure holds the interpretive key for understanding Bonaventure's theological interpretation of Francis. Furthermore, it presents the *Legenda major*'s theology of Francis as part of Bonaventure's program of reform by way of imitation of Francis. To understand the *Legenda major* as a text of reform, its liturgical, historical, and hagiographical contexts must be explained. Accordingly, this essay divides into two parts: (1) the text's date and contexts, and (2) the text's structure.

Date and Contexts

Dating: 1257 to 1261

In the *Legenda major*'s prologue, Bonaventure recounts three reasons for writing a new life of Francis: "I would never had attempted it if the brothers' fervent desire had not aroused me, the unanimous urging of the general Chapter had not induced me, and the devotion that I am obliged to have toward our holy father had not compelled me."[3] Yet, the passage

---

[1] They include: *Vita beati Francisci* (1C, c. 1229), *Officio rhythmica s. Francisci* (Off, c. 1228–1232), *Legendae ad usum chori* (LCh, c. 1230–1232), *Vita sancti Francisci* (LJS, c. 1232–1235), *Legenda s. Francisci versificata* (VL, c. 1232–1239), *Sacrum commercium sancti Francisci cum domina Paupertate* (ScEx, c. 1237–1239), *De legenda chorali Umbra* (UChL, c. 1237–1239), *Anonymi Perusini* (AP, c. 1240–1241), *Legenda trium sociorum* (L3C, c. 1241–1244), *Compilatio Assisiensis* (AC, c. 1244–1245), *Memoriale in desiderio animae* (2C, c. 1245–1247), *Tractatus de miraculis beati Francisci* (3C, c. 1250–1252). The Latin texts are in *Fontes Franciscani*, ed. Enrico Menestò and Stefano Brufani (Assisi: 1995); for the *Legenda major* see 777–977; *miracula*, 912–961.

[2] LMj prol. 3.1–2; see the section below on dating the *Legenda major*.

[3] LMj prol. 3.2 (*Fontes*, 779): *id nullatenus attentassem, nisi me fratrum fervens incitasset affectus, generalis quoque Capituli concors induxisset instantia, et ea quam ad sanctum patrem habere teneor devotion compulisset.*

does not identify which general Chapter asked him to write a new life. This has led to an ambiguity in dating the text. Two scenarios predominate: the 1257 Rome Chapter that elected Bonaventure,[4] or the more commonly accepted 1260 Narbonne Chapter where Bonaventure presided over his first general Chapter.[5] The *Definitiones* from the Rome Chapter contain a short but significant statute: "Likewise it is ordained concerning the legend of blessed Francis, that one good one be compiled from all the others."[6] Some identify this statute with 1257,[7] others claim it came from 1260 and was inserted into the earlier statutes.[8]

The *Annales minorum* (1732),[9] the Quaracchi *Opera omnia* (1898),[10] and *Analecta Franciscana* (1941) all claim a 1260 dating,[11] but each cites the previous source as evidence for identifying Narbonne as the Chapter that asked Bonaventure to write the two *legendae*.[12] Yet, the base source, the *Annales minorum*, simply cites the *Legenda major*'s prologue where

---

[4] Bonaventure was in Paris when the Chapter in Rome elected him on 2 February 1257. He learned of his election sometime before his *First Encyclical Letter*, dated 23 April 1257.

[5] For example, the prevalent chronologies compiled by Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction a saint Bonaventure* (Paris: 1988); English trans. of 1st ed. (1961): *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson, N.J.: 1963), 4. Also see *Francesco e Bonaventura: La* Legenda major (Venice: 1984), 12, 18–20. Introductions accompanying modern editions and translations of the *Legenda major* unanimously claim a 1260 date: *Fontes Franciscani*, 755; *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents,* vol. 2: *The Founder*, ed. Regis Armstrong, Wayne Hellmann, and William Short (New York: 2000), 495 (hereafter FA:ED 2); *Vita di San Francesco:* Legenda maior, ed. Pietro Messa (Milan: 2009), 53; *François d'Assise: Écrits, Vies, témoignages*, vol. 2, ed. Jacques Dalarun (Paris: 2010), 2207; and *Franziskus-Quellen: Die Schriften des heiligen Franziskus, Lebenbeschreibungen, Chroniken und Zeugnisse über ihn und seinen Orden*, ed. Dieter Berg and Leonhard Lehmann (Kevelaer: 2009), 689.

[6] Statute 74: *Item ordinetur de legenda beati Francisci, ut de omnibus una bona compiletur.* In *Ceremoniale ordinis minorum vetutissimum* seu *"ordinationes divini officii" sub Ioanne de Parma ministro generali emanatae an. 1254*, ed. Giralomo Golubovich, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 76.

[7] Golubovich claims that the directive actually comes from the 1257 General Chapter of Rome, a dating that Delorme, Van Dijk, and Monti agree with: Ferdinand Delorme, "Diffinitiones capituli Generalis O.F.M. Narbonensis (1260)," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 492, n. 1; Stephen Van Dijk and Joan Walker, *The Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century*, vol. 2 (Westminster, Md.: 1963), 417 n. 3; and Dominic Monti, *Writings Concerning the Franciscan Order* (Works of Saint Bonaventure) 5 (Saint Bonaventure, NY: 1994), 137 n. 2.

[8] Michael Bihl, *Analecta Franciscana* 10, lxiii, n. 1 claims that the 1260 statute was inserted into the earlier *Definitiones*: "it was inserted from the year 1260" (*anno 1260 inserta est*).

[9] *Annales minorum* 4, 137 n. 18.

[10] Bonaventure, *Opera omnia* 8, lxxxv, and 10.

[11] *Analecta Franciscana* 10, lxii–iii, lxxii.

[12] *Analecta Franciscana* 10 assumes (lxii) and cites (lxxii n. 1) the narrative of the *Opera omnia* (10, 53–55), which in turn, cites (10, 53 n. 6, and 55 n. 1) the *Annales minorum* 4 (137, n. 18).

Bonaventure mentions that a general Chapter urged him to write. The *Annales* assumes Bonaventure's account refers to the 1260 Chapter of Narbonne. Hence, the argument for a 1260 dating is ultimately circular. Since the assumed evidence in the *Annales minorum* is less reliable than the modern textual analysis that dates the statute to 1257,[13] it is safe to conclude that the 1257 Rome Chapter commissioned a new *legenda* at the same time it elected Bonaventure minister general.

By 1259, Bonaventure had not yet completed the task,[14] so it is unlikely that either the *Legenda major* or *minor* was presented at the Chapter of Narbonne in 1260. Instead, two later Catalogues report that Bonaventure completed it after the Chapter of Narbonne in 1261. The earlier *Catalogus XV Generalium* (c. 1304) simply states: "In the first Chapter, which was held in Narbonne, [Bonaventure] gave the Constitutions their order and form. After this, he wrote the life of Saint Francis."[15] The later *Catalogus XXIV Generalium* (c. 1360) provides more detail:

> In the year of the Lord 1261 the same General composed a life of Saint Francis in a wonderful style, and by reducing the longer version into a shorter version, he organized a series of nine lessons for each day during his Octave, in which he included nothing unless it was certain and approved by suitable trustworthy witnesses.[16]

---

[13] See footnote 7.

[14] The Cistercians' 1259 General Chapter in mid-September requested a life of St Francis so they could celebrate the octave of his feast; J.M. Canivez, ed., *Statuta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis*, vol. 2 (Louvain: 1934), 450 n. 9. The next year at Narbonne, the Franciscans reciprocated and decreed that Bernard's feast be celebrated on 20 August (statute 18c, Monti, *Writings*, 141). A similar exchange had already occurred between the Cistercians and Dominicans in 1235 (Van Dijk, *Origins*, 372, 348). While there is some disagreement on what Bonaventure sent to the Cistercians (1C or LCh), it was not the LMj or LMn, which suggests that they were not yet finished. However, since Bonaventure wrote the *Iitinerarium mentis in Deum* in October 1259, during which time he had the opportunity to meet Leo and Giles and possibly "interview" them (LMj prol. 4), it seems that Bonaventure was already at work on the *legendae*. In texts dating from 1259, Bonaventure twice states he met Leo: *Itinerarium* 7.3 (5, 312), and *A Letter to the Abbess and Sisters of the Monastery of St Clare in Assisi* (8, 473).

[15] *Analecta franciscana* 3 (1897): 700: *Hic in primo capitulo, quod tenuit Narbonae, Constitutionibus ordinem et formam dedit. Hic postquam vitam beati Francisci conscripsit.* This catalogue is also called *Catalogus Gonsalvinus*.

[16] *Analecta franciscana* 3 (1897): 328: *Anno Domini MCCLXI idem Generalis vitam beati Francisci stilo mirabili compilavit ipsamque diffusam ad compendiosiorem formam reducens, taxatis pro die qualibet IX lectionibus per Octavas eiusdem, Legendam ordinavit, in qua nihil posuit nisi certum et probatum testibus fide dignis.* This catalogue is also called the *Chronica Generalium Ministrorum.*

Furthermore, since Bonaventure does not mention the death of Brother Giles within the *Legenda major* (23 April 1262),[17] the text was completed before that date: sometime in 1261.

Although the 1263 General Chapter of Pisa contains no reference to their completion or acceptance, the *Legenda major* and *minor* were probably approved there.[18] Three years later, the 1266 Paris General Chapter decreed the infamous eleventh statute:

> The general chapter likewise commands, under obedience, that all the legends of St Francis hitherto composed shall be deleted (*deleantur*), and that the brothers should make every effort to remove any copies that may be found outside the Order, since the new legend written by the general minister has been compiled from what he himself gathered from the accounts of those who almost constantly accompanied St Francis and thus had certain knowledge of each and every thing; whatever it contains, therefore, has been carefully proven.[19]

The motive for deleting/destroying the earlier lives, likely to be shocking to the modern reader, was not a political maneuver to present a sanitized saint in an effort to suppress factions within the order;[20] rather, the primary motive was liturgical uniformity. The order needed to disseminate

---

[17] LMj 3.4 (*Fontes*, 797; FA:ED 2, 544).

[18] *Analecta Franciscana* 10, lxxii. Although neither the Pisa statutes nor any chronicle or any other source reports the approval of the *Legendae* at Pisa, the scenario is probably accurate. Hence, I agree with Bihl's inference that the 1263 Pisa Chapter "accepted and praised" the *Legendae*, but I am more wary of his assumption (*sic existimamus*) that Bonaventure provided thirty-four *exempla*, one for each providence. While possible, it cannot be verified.

[19] Statute 11: *Item praecipit generale Capitulum per obedientiam, quod omnes legendae de B. Francisco olim factae deleantur, et ubi extra Ordinem inveniri poterunt, ipsas Fratres student amovere, cum illa Legenda, quae facta est per generalem Ministrum fuerit compilata prout ipse habuit ab ore eorum, qui cum B. Francisco quasi simper fuerunt et cuncta certitudinaliter sciverint, et probate ibi sint posita diligenter.* In Andrew Little, ed., "Definitiones capitulorum generalium Ordinis Fratrum Minorum," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 7 (1914): 678. Monti, *Writings*, 202. For different explanations of the 1266 Parisian decree see Michael Bihl, "De vero sensu Definitionis capituli generalis an. 1266 Legendas antiquiores S. Francisci proscribentis," *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 30 (1937): 274–280.

[20] Recent studies have highlighted the political dimensions, for example: Giovanni Miccoli, *Francesco d'Assisi: Realtà e memoria di un'esperienza cristiana* (Turin: 1991), 264–301; Chiara Frugoni, *Francesco e l'invenzione delle stimmate* (Turin: 1993), 69–71, 173–182, 210–216; Duncan Nimmo, *Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order* (Rome: 1995), 73–78; Jacques Dalarun, *The Misadventure of Francis of Assisi* (Saint Bonaventure: 2002), 221–258; Jacques Dalarun, *Francis of Assisi and the Feminine* (Saint Bonaventure: 2006), 223–235; also see Jacques Dalarun, *Francis of Assisi and Power* (Saint Bonaventure: 2007), which critiques Bonaventure in a similar vein throughout the text but only cites/refers to the *Legenda major* a few times.

a "good legend"[21] for public reading during Francis' octave, and the order also needed a new legend for refectory reading. These two venues required two different texts, but the texts needed to corroborate with each other. Such is the case with Thomas of Celano's *Life of Saint Francis* (1229) and his *Legend for Use in the Choir* (c. 1230–32), which became outdated when Francis' feast became an octave in the early 1240s.[22] Indeed, the same effort for liturgical uniformity was attempted by the Dominicans, who approved the new *Legenda* written by Humbert of Romans in 1256, which eclipsed the earlier lives.[23] As to deleting or destroying earlier texts, a precedent had already been set at the 1260 Chapter of Narbonne, which ordered the removal of the order's earlier constitutions: "once the new constitutions have been published, any old copies are to be destroyed."[24] In short, the Franciscans, like the Dominicans, were engaged in liturgical reforms throughout the 1250s, reforms that tried to avoid spawning variant textual traditions.

Liturgical Context

The liturgical context helps explain why the 1257 Rome Chapter requested a new life of St Francis. Neither Thomas of Celano's *Legenda ad usum chori* (c. 1230–32), which contains nine lessons used for the Mass celebrating the feast of St Francis' *dies natalis* as a "double office" (3–4 October),[25] nor his *Umbrian Choir Legend* (c. 1237–1239),[26] which was not organized

---

[21] See below, note 30 and related text.

[22] Van Dijk, *Origins*, 242, 292–293, and 379.

[23] *Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. Benedict Maria Reichert, vol. 1 (Rome: 1898), 105. Also see Luigi Canetti, *L'invenzione della memoria: Il culto e l'immagine di Domenico nella storia dei primi frati Predicatori* (Spoleto: 1996), 402–425; and Edward Brett, *Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* (Toronto: 1994), 93–94.

[24] Statute 1 (Delorme, "Diffinitiones," in AFH 3, 502; Monti, *Writings*, 138): *Et, istis publicatis, veteres destruantur.*

[25] The term "double office" comes from the practice of celebrating a double night office on major feasts. The "double" began with the vigil at "First Vespers" the night before the feast and would continue through the eight hours of the actual feast day, ending with "Second Vespers" on the feast day itself. Hence the need for nine readings and the name "double" since vespers was recited twice. The "double office" was more solemn than the simple office, which would only contain the Vespers on the vigil. For further explanation see Van Dijk, *Origins*, 293; and John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century* (New York: 1991), 53–57 and 73–108.

[26] Jacques Dalarun actually provides three possible dates, each more restrictive: 1235–1253, 1237–1244, and 1237–1239. He later identifies 1237–1239 as most probable, "De St. Bonaventure à la *Légende Ombrienne* et de la *Légende Ombrienne* à St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 66 (2008): 506.

according to lessons,[27] satisfied the new *Ordinal* published after Haymo of Faversham's death (c. 1245).[28] Haymo's *Ordinal* celebrates Francis' feast day as an octave (4–11 October), not as a "double," and adds the feast of Francis' Translation (25 May).[29] This important liturgical development explains why Haymo did not identify a liturgical legend in the *Ordinal* of 1245:[30] neither of Celano's earlier texts contained the required sixty-three readings needed for an octave. Thus, the 1257 Chapter of Rome called for a *legenda* written for an octave, because one did not exist.

While the *Ordinal* (*Ordinarium*, c. 1245) identified Francis' feast as an octave, the *Ceremonial for Choir* (*Ordinationes divini Officii*, c. 1245–1254), an "ordinal with rules for how to sing and read, to direct the choir, etc.," is what gave distinct liturgical form to its celebration.[31] A possible 1251/1254 dating for the *Ceremonial* helps explain why the 1257 Rome Chapter asked for a new *legenda*: it was the necessary next step in the Order's liturgical reform agenda, an agenda that Bonaventure inherited and advanced when he became minister general in 1257.[32]

---

[27] Instead, it divides into two parts: (1) the last two years of Francis' life, death, burial, canonization, and translation, and (2) twenty-three episodes concerning Francis' post-mortem miracles. Jacques Dalarun, *Vers une resolution de la question franciscaine: La Légende Ombrienne de Thomas de Celano* (Paris: 2007), even questions whether the *Umbrian Choir Legend* was even originally written for liturgical use. Also see his comments in, "De St. Bonaventure," 507.

[28] An *Ordinal* (*ordo*) was a liturgical reference book that provided instructions for the order of the Mass or the Office or other liturgical celebration performed with religious ritual. The most common type of *ordinal* contained both rules for performing the rite and identification of texts required for the ritual. Hence, the rules were interspersed with the order of texts; see Van Dijk, *Origins*, 26–27.

[29] Van Dijk, *Origins*, 242–243 and 379. The octave is also a "double" because the first and last days repeat, that is, one week plus the actual feast day.

[30] Van Dijk, *Origins*, 381; *Sources*, vol. 1, 84–85.

[31] Van Dijk, *Origins*, 299; Van Dijk states that the publication was sometime between 1245 and 1251 (319 and 321); *Sources*, vol. 1, 106, gives the dates of 1245–1254. Quotation from Van Dijk, *Sources*, 97. In effect, the *Ceremonial* was more precise than the *Ordinal* in providing instructions concerning the performance of the rites. Monti, *Writings*, 181 n. 14, describes the relationship between the *Ordinal* and *Ceremonial*: "The *Ordinal* established the content of the services, the ceremonial explained how they were to be performed, detailing the rituals to be used at the community celebrations of the Office and Mass." The 1263 Pisa statues explicitly identify the *Ordinal* and *Ceremonial* together at the outset, before the statutes regarding liturgical rubrics are listed; see Van Dijk, *Sources*, vol. 2, 421, and Monti, *Writings*, 181.

[32] A 1257 date also coordinates well with the liturgical reform activities undertaken by the Dominicans during the 1250s. The 1254 chapter asked Humbert of Romans to revise the entire liturgy. In response, Humbert wrote a new *legenda* of St Dominic. Both the liturgical revisions and the *legenda* were definitively approved at the 1256 Chapter. See Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, 93. Hence, it seems that the Franciscans may have been following the Dominican lead at their 1257 Chapter at Rome, which requested that (1) the books for

A comparison of the 1257 Chapter of Rome Statutes and the 1260 Narbonne Statutes illustrates Bonaventure's advancement of the liturgical reform/codification agenda. The first statute from 1257 states, "Likewise, the correction of the books for the divine office is entrusted to the minister general."[33] The second statute from 1260 indicates that the request had been completed: "Before the next general chapter the ministers should see to it that the text of breviaries and missals be corrected on the basis of the more trustworthy exemplar, which is at their disposal, in accordance with the approved custom of the Order."[34] Hence, the 1260 Chapter of Narbonne codified the existing constitutions and corrected the books for the divine office[35]—two massive projects that Bonaventure accomplished in his first three years as minister general. The administrative workload helps explain why the 1257 request for a new *legenda* was likely not finished until sometime after the Chapter of Narbonne.[36]

But why did Bonaventure, in response to Rome's call for a *legenda* for choir, write two *Legendae*, the *major* and *minor*? The evidence is twofold. On the one hand, prefatory notations from two manuscripts indicate that the two texts were written for two related but distinct contexts and audiences:[37]

---

the Office be corrected and (2) a new *legenda* of Francis be written. The Franciscans, like the Dominicans, understand liturgy and hagiography to be intimately interconnected.

[33] Van Dijk, *Sources*, vol. 2, 417: *Item correctio librorum pro divino officio ministro committitur generali.*

[34] Van Dijk, *Sources*, vol. 2, 419: *Studeant ministri quod usque ad sequens capitulum generale littera, breviariorum et missalium corrigatur secundum exemplar veritus, quod habere poterunt, secundum ordinis approbatam consuetudinem.* While the statute only mentions the breviary and the missal, Van Dijk, *Origins*, 322, claims that the statute probably concerned five books that were already circulating: "a capitulary with kalendar, tonale and prayers for grace, a gradual, a martyrology, a missal and probably and antiphonal."

[35] As part of the liturgical reform, the 1260 Chapter does order a change to Julian of Speyer's *Rhymed Office of Saint Francis*, "The last two lines of the antiphon which begins 'This man had an indecent upbringing in the vanities' should be changed to: 'Through divine gifts he was mercifully delivered.'" The original second antiphon read (c. 1231): *Hic vir in vanitatibus /Nutritus indecenter / Plus suis nutrioribus / Se gessit insolenter* (He foolishly governed himself, even more than his parents). The Narbonne statute changed it (1260) to: *Hic vir in vanitatibus /Nutritus indecenter / Divinis charismatibus / Praeventus est clementer* ("He foolishly governed himself. Through divine gifts he was mercifully delivered"). Note that the parallel texts in the LMj 1.1 and LMn 1.1 reflect Narbonne's statute regarding the amendment to Francis' early life. LMj 1.1 actually shares similar phraseology, which suggests that the LMj was finished after 1260.

[36] See note 14 and related text. Bonaventure did not send the Cistercians a newly completed *Legenda minor* in mid-September 1259; this indicates that it was likely not yet finished.

[37] The fourteenth-century Vatican Codex 7570 was known to the Quaracchi editors preparing Bonaventure's *Opera omnia*. The thirteenth-century Portiuncula MS was not, but it

> This major Life or Legend of Saint Francis may be kept in any place for the edification of the brothers. It can be read at table through the entire octave of the Death of Saint Francis. However, the minor Legend, which is excerpted from it, should be placed in choral books and read according to their distinctions in the feast of Saint Francis and through the octave of his Death. And it can be placed in portable Breviaries. Therefore, scribes are compelled to preserve the punctuations and text of the exemplar; and their errors are to be diligently corrected by the brothers according to the exemplar itself.[38]

The notation of the two exemplar manuscripts identifies the *major* for the general edification of the brothers and for refectory reading during Francis' octave.[39] Reading at table during the octave places the *Legenda major* within a quasi-liturgical framework,[40] and "the edification of the brothers" identifies the text as a semi-private document that is primarily intended for the brothers' consumption: either via refectory reading at other times throughout the year,[41] or during house chapters in a manner similar to the *Constitutions*,[42] or by a brother's private reading for edification, especially

---

was included in the 1941 *Analecta Franciscana* 10 edition. Both manuscripts identify LMj 15 with nine lectures for the feast of Francis' Translation (25 May5).

[38] *Analecta Franciscana* 10, lxxiv and lxxvi: *Hec maior Vita sive Legenda B. Francisci pro edificatione Fratrum in loco quolibet habeatur; et potest legi ad mensam per totam octavam Natalis B. Francisci. Minor autem Legenda, que de hac excerpta est; poni debet in libris choralibus et legi secundum suas distinctiones in festivitatibus B. Francisci et per octavam Natalis eius; et in Breviariis portatilibus potest poni. Scriptores ergo compellantur tenere punctationes et litteram exemplaris; et eorum errores iuxta ipsum exemplar per fratrum dilligentiam corrigantur.*

[39] In contrast, another thirteenth-century manuscript containing only the *Legenda minor* (Assisi Codex 347) contains an inserted folio with a prefatory notation identifying the *Legenda minor* with refectory reading: *Convenientius etiam de ea [minore] legi potest ad mensam ipsis diebus festivitatum B. Francisci.* This thirteenth-century manuscript is odd because it consists of three compilations written in two different hands: the prologue to the *Legenda major*, the aforementioned notation written in a different hand, followed by the *Legenda minor*, and ch. 15 of the *Legenda major* for the celebration of Francis' translation, written in the same hand as the prologue. The product is a codex for Francis' octave and translation introduced by the *major*'s prologue devised for both formal liturgical celebration and table reading. Apparently the rubric was changed from the other two *exempla* because of the absence of the *Legenda major*. Of course, the compilation is not altogether coherent, because the prologue introduces the fifteen chapters of the LMj, which are absent.

[40] I identify the mentioned refectory reading as "quasi-liturgical" because the timeframe for its performance is the commemoration of Francis' octave. The *major* was likely used for refectory reading at other times throughout the year, but this practice would have varied according to houses.

[41] *Reg. nov.* 5.1 (8, 481); Monti, *Writings*, 161.

[42] Statute 1 (Delorme, "Diffinitiones," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3, 502; Monti, *Writings*, 138).

novices,[43] who should "occupy themselves during this time with writings profitable for their edification, as their master so disposes."[44]

On the other hand, Bonaventure reports another reason in the prologue itself, which is more personal and practical:

> For when I was a boy, as I still vividly remember, I was snatched from the jaws of death by his invocation and merits. So if I remained silent and did not sing his praises, I fear that I would be rightly accused of the crime of ingratitude. And this [the crime of ingratitude] was the principal reason in me (*penes me*) for accepting this labor [of writing], so that I—who recognize that my life, body and soul, was saved by God through him and who acknowledge to have experienced his power (*virtutem*) in my own self—may collect as much as possible, although not fully, the virtues (*virtutes*), deeds and words of his life, like so many fragments, partly forgotten and partly scattered, lest they be lost when those who lived with this servant of God die.[45]

While recognizing the rhetorical dimension to the claim, the "principal reason" is Bonaventure's own debt to Francis, which motivated him, more than the urgings of his brothers and Chapter, to gather together the scattered fragments "lest they be lost when those who lived with this servant of God die."[46] The sheer magnitude of hagiographical material produced before Bonaventure could not be accommodated by the predetermined structure of sixty-three lectures prescribed by the octave. Much, much more material existed. The quantity prompted Bonaventure to write the *Legenda major* in addition to the *minor* so as to incorporate the extensive material. Salimbene seems to echo this sentiment: "Later, however, Brother Bonaventure wrote an excellent life of Francis, based on all these

---

[43] *Reg. nov.* 9.2 (8, 484); Monti, *Writings*, 166.

[44] *Const. Narb.* 1.9 (8, 451; Monti, *Writings*, 78): *In scripturis vero aedificationis liceat eis secundum dispositionem magistri sui pro tempore occupari.*

[45] LMj prol. 3 (*Fontes*, 779; FA:ED 2, 528): *timeo sceleris argui ut ingrates. Et haec penes me causa praecipua hunc assumendi laborem, ut ego, qui vitam corporis et animae a Deo mihi conservatam recognosco per ipsum et virtutem eius in me ipso expertus agnovi, vitae illius virtutes, actus et verba quasi fragmenta quaedam, partim neglecta partimque dispersa, quamquam plene non possem, utcumque colligerem, ne, morientibus his qui cum famulo Dei convixerant, deperirent.* Note the allusion to Jn. 6:12: "Gather up the fragments left over, so that nothing may be lost."

[46] Note that Bonaventure recognizes that something will be lost when the final companions who personally knew Francis all die. In effect, the absence of Francis is compounded by the absence of those who knew him. In response, Bonaventure gathers the stories within a theological framework that strives to make Francis present to the brothers. Hence, Bonaventure's *Legenda major* is not simply a remembrance of things past, but a claim that Francis becomes present to the brothers through their imitation of him.

previous works."[47] In short, Bonaventure was asked to write a *legenda* for choir, but his sources far exceeded the parameters of his task, so, in the tradition of 1C and LCh, he created two new complementary narratives for two different needs and audiences.

Yet, another aspect, mentioned in the same paragraph cited above, distinguishes the *Legenda major* from the earlier hagiographical sources and from the contemporaneous *minor*.[48] Bonaventure states, "I feel myself unworthy and unequal to this task of describing the life of a man so venerable and worthy of complete imitation (*imitatione*)."[49] Bonaventure employs the term "imitation" nine times,[50] four times in the prologue and five times within the text. Likewise, four occurrences concern imitation of Francis and five Francis' imitation of others.[51] In effect, Bonaventure wrote the *Legenda major* in an attempt to move the brothers from an admiration and remembrance of Francis to an imitation of him.[52] While it is often asserted that Bonaventure constructs a portrait of Francis that is impossible for the brothers to imitate,[53] such interpretations ignore

---

[47] Joseph Baird, *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam* (New York: 1986), 166.

[48] While the earlier hagiographical tradition called for admiration, love and remembrance, the *Legenda major* calls for imitation (see note 50). However, imitation is not altogether absent from the earlier hagiographical tradition (e.g., 2C 17). Interestingly, the explicit mention of "imitation" is absent in the *Legenda minor*. The omission could possibly be because that text was a public liturgical document intended for the ecclesial celebration of Francis' octave, a celebration that could be attended by brothers and non-brothers as well as used by other religious communities in the celebration of Francis' octave. However, the omission is odd, considering that the *minor* was inserted into the brothers' breviaries.

[49] LMj prol. 3 (*Fontes*, 779; FA:ED 2, 528): *Ad huius tam venerabilis viri vitam omni imitation dignissimam describendam indignum et insufficientem me sentiens.*

[50] *imitabilis*: LMj prol. 2.1, 6.2.16; *imitatio*: LMj prol. 3.1, 11.2.8, 14.4.17; *imitator*: LMj prol. 2.3: 3.10.9; *imitatorius*: LMj prol. 1.16; and *imitor*: LMj 13.2.6.

[51] Imitation of Francis: LMj prol. 2.1, 6.2.16, prol. 3.1 and 3.10.9. Francis' imitation of others: LMj prol. 1.16 (John the Baptist), prol. 2.3 (angels), and 11.2.8, 13.2.6, 14.4.17 (Christ).

[52] The 1C prologue ends, "Thanks be to Almighty God, who always displays Himself in His saints as worthy of admiration and love" [*Gratias omnipotenti Deo qui semper in sanctis suis admirabilem et amabilem se ostendit*]. The 2C prologue begins, "to write down (. . .) for the consolation of our contemporaries and the remembrance of future generations" [*ad consolationem praesentium et posterorum memoriam scriberemus*]. And the incipit reads, "Here begins the remembrance about the desire of a soul regarding the deeds and words of our most holy father Francis" [*Incipit memoria in desiderio animae de gestis et verbis sanctissimi patris nostri Francisci*]. In effect, 1C proposes a "life" that is "worthy of admiration and love," 2C presents a "remembrance" that fosters "consolation," and LMj provides "a life of a man so venerable and worthy of imitation" [*tam venerabilis viri vitam omni imitatione*].

[53] Dalarun, *Misadventure*, 254, claims that Bonaventure presents a Francis who is impossible for the brothers to imitate. He is not alone in this assertion, see Giovanni Merlo, *In the Name of Saint Francis* (Saint Bonaventure: 2009), 200–220, esp. 205–206.

Bonaventure's repeated assertions to the contrary. More importantly, some critiques even disregard the very means by which Bonaventure invites the reader to imitate Francis: the triple way ensconced within the text's structure,[54] which leads the reader, like Francis, to the miracle of the stigmata.[55]

The only possible evidence against imitation is the episode regarding Francis being dragged before a crowd in the piazza of Assisi to confess he had secretly eaten meat to regain his health. Redacting 1C 52/LJS 32, Bonaventure states:

> Therefore those who had gathered there were amazed to see so great a spectacle (*spectaculo*), and because they were well aware of his austerity, and so their hearts were struck with compunction; but they professed that his humility was easier to admire than to imitate. Although it may appear to be more a warning like a prophetic utterance than an example, nevertheless it was truly a lesson in perfect humility, which instructed the observer of Christ (*Christi spectator*) that he must condemn the fame of transitory praise, suppress the arrogance of bloated bragging, and reject the lies of deceptive pretense.[56]

Bonaventure redacts the earlier sources in several key ways: the episode is about Francis' humility, not his perceived gluttony; Francis enters the church with his brothers before going to the piazza; the single brother accompanying Francis multiplies into many brothers; the event becomes an example of Francis' preaching "coming forth from the church;" and most importantly, Bonaventure employs the word "imitation,"[57] as he

---

[54] For example, Dalarun, *Misadventure*, 238 states: "But if we are to deal with the text we must pass over the subtleties of the threefold mystic way and go back to the old stratigraphic method." To pass over the triple way is to ignore the structure that explains how and why Bonaventure arranges his sources, i.e., the stratigraphic method. Both are needed: an analysis of the sources and an understanding of the structure.

[55] Critiques of Bonaventure also fault him for emphasizing the stigmata because the mystical overshadows the historical, that is, theology destroys history. However, all the earlier sources, especially the works of Thomas of Celano and Julian of Speyer, emphasize the stigmata.

[56] LMj 6.2 (*Fontes*, 824; FA:ED 2, 570): *Igitur qui convenerant, tam ingenti viso spectaculo, admirati sunt, et quia ipsius austeritatem iam noverant, devote corde compuncti, humilitatem huismodi magis admirabilem quam imitabilem proclamabant. Licet autem id magis videatur portentum fuisse instar prophetalis vaticinii quam exemplum, tamen vere documentum exstitit humilitatis perfectae, quo Christi spectator instruitur transitoriae laudis praeconium debere contemnere, tumentis quoque iactantiae comprimere fastum et fraudulentae simulationis mendacium confutare.* Note the tension between "admire" and "imitate" which echoes a difference between the earlier hagiography of Tomas of Celano and that of Bonaventure; see note 46 and related text.

[57] 1C 52 uses the word "example," not "imitation."

contrasts Francis' observers (the crowd) with Francis' observation of Christ that encourages the reader/hearer (i.e., the brothers) to embrace the three lessons in perfect humility. Just as the brothers contrast with the crowd, perfect humility contrasts with the fame of praise, the arrogance of bragging, and the lies of pretense. In short, the redacted passage expects a Lesser Brother to do more than the crowd. Far from denying an imitation of Francis, this episode is an invitation to identify with Francis instead of with the crowd, and thereby move beyond admiration to imitation.[58] The distinction between the "crowd" and the "brothers" appears in a similar way in the prologue: "Francis, God's messenger, worthy to be loved by Christ, imitated by us, and admired by the world, was God's servant."[59] Likewise, the first sentence of the prologue is explicit: "all lovers of true humility and holy poverty" should "learn by [Francis'] example (…) to live in conformity with Christ."[60] In short, just as Francis learned from Christ, the brothers should learn from Francis, who will lead them to Christ.

Ch. 3 also combines imitation with birthing imagery.[61] At the outset of the chapter, Francis "conceived and brought to birth the spirit of Gospel truth" by becoming an "imitator of evangelical perfection."[62] At the end of the chapter, during Innocent III's approval of the Rule, Bonaventure returns to the maternal imagery via Francis' parable of the rich king married to a poor woman who bore him children with the king's likeness.[63] In a redaction of 2C 16–17, Bonaventure states:

---

[58] The focus on humility instead of austerity is not an attempt to present a lax image of Francis' austerity. Rather, the relationship between austerity and humility mentioned within the episode should be interpreted within the wider context of the text. Ch. 5 treated austerity, the chapter containing this episode concerns humility, and ch. 7 focuses on poverty. This episode on humility moves beyond austerity, while not leaving it behind, as it examines humility and then poverty, etc.

[59] LMj prol. 2 (*Fontes*, 778; FA:ED 2, 527): *Hunc Dei nuntium amabilem Christo, imitabilem nobis et admirabilem mundo servum Dei fuisse Franciscum.*

[60] LMj prol. 1 (*Fontes*, 777; FA:ED 2, 525): *omnibus vere humilibus et sanctae paupertatis amicis (…) ipsius erudiuntur exemplo (…) Christo conformiter vivere.*

[61] Also see LMj 8.1 (*Fontes*, 890; FA:ED 2, 587): "[Francis] seemed like a mother who was daily bringing them to birth in Christ" [*ut eas tamquam mater in Christo quotidie parturiret*]; and LMj 8.3.

[62] LMj 3.1–2 (*Fontes*, 794–795; FA:ED 2, 542–543): *concepit ipse ac peperit spiritum evangelicae veritatis (…) evangelicae perfectionis aemulator.*

[63] Throughout the chapter Bonaventure employs mother/offspring imagery to depict Francis and his brothers: LMj 3.1: "he conceived and brought to birth the spirit of Gospel truth"; 3.3: "firstborn son (…) conception of his first child"; 3.7: "the number of offspring to seven (…) the sterile simplicity of our holy father had already brought seven to birth"; 3.10: "born of a poor mother." And the final scripture citation from Lk. 11:28 that ends the

> The sons and heirs of the eternal King should not fear that they will die of hunger. They have been born of a poor mother by the power of the Holy Spirit in the image of Christ the King, and they will be begotten by the spirit of poverty in a poor little religion. For if the King of heaven promises his imitators an eternal kingdom, he will certainly supply them with those things that he gives to the good and the bad alike.[64]

Francis is the poor mother and Christ the rich king who "promises his imitators an eternal kingdom." Whereas 2C only mentions one birth, Bonaventure mentions two: one in the past (the sons born of the poor mother by the Spirit's power) and one in the future (the *imitators* who will be born "by the spirit of poverty in our poor little religion" (*religio paupercula*, i.e., the Rule). The point is that Francis begot sons and the Rule, and by living the Rule his sons/brothers can imitate Christ.

The *Legenda major*'s quasi-liturgical context presents, like the *Legenda minor*, a "prayed Francis," who is the example,[65] even the "exemplar of all Gospel perfection,"[66] whom the brothers should imitate so they become conformed to Christ just as Francis conformed to him.[67] Yet, at the same time that the order continued working on its liturgical reform/codification

---

chapter is suggestive. For Lk. 11:27 reads: "While he was saying this, a woman in the crowd raised her voice and said to him, 'Blessed is the womb that bore you and the breasts that nursed you!' " Lk. 11:28, cited by Bonaventure, reads: "But he said, 'Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and obey it!' " Given the birthing imagery throughout the chapter, it is certainly plausible that Bonaventure implied the connection between the womb and the Word.

[64] LMj 3.10.3–4 (*Fontes*, 802; FA:ED 2, 548): *Non est formidandum, quod fame pereant aeterni Regis filii et heredes, qui ad imaginem Regis Christi per Spiritus sancti virtutem de pauper matre nati, et ipsi per spiritum paupertatis sunt in religion paupercula generandi. Si enim Rex caelorum imitatoribus suis regnum promittit aeternum, quanto magis illa subministrabit, quae communiter largitur bonis et malis.* Bonaventure adopts the imagery of imitation from 2C 17, which mentions the imitation of Christ (*imitatione Christi*) as relating to the brothers.

[65] Bonaventure uses the word "example" (*exemplum*) thirty-three times: twenty-one refer to Francis as an example (prol. 1.5, prol. 1.17, prol. 2.4, 3.3, 3.7, 4.3, 5.1, 5.1, 5.6, 5.7, 6.2, 6.10, 9.4 x3, 10.7, 12.8, 13.10, 14.3, and 15.6); four refer to Francis' description of things: service (8.1), the good preacher (8.2), obedience (6.4), and charity (5.7); one refers to the brothers (4.1), or Francis' curse/description of brothers who present bad examples (x2 8.3); four refer to Christ (4.2, 6.1, 11.1, 12.1); and one refers to Bernard (3.3).

[66] LMj 15.1 (*Fontes*, 905; FA:ED, 645): *totius evangelicae perfectionis exemplar*; also see LMj 5.7. Bonaventure uses the term "exemplar" four times; three refer to Francis (LMj 1.3, 15.1, 5.7), and one to Christ (12.1), which Francis replicates by preaching, that is, since Christ gave everything to save everyone, Francis gives up everything to preach salvation in Christ to everyone.

[67] Bonaventure mentions "conformity" (*conformis, conformo, conformiter*) ten times. Nine refer to Francis being conformed: once to his host (LMj 5.1), once to the brothers (10.4), once to Moses and Elisha (7.13), and five times to Christ (prol. 2, 13.1, 13.2, 14.4 x2), of which two occurrences have imitation explicitly leading to conformity (13.2, 14.4). Once, in

that had begun in the 1240s, a codification that carefully located Francis within the all-encompassing liturgical framework that structured the brothers' daily lives, the brothers were also engaged in a conflict throughout the 1250s that questioned their form of life and even threatened their very existence. Accordingly, the secular-mendicant controversy intersects with the order's liturgical efforts.

Historical Context

Bonaventure's involvement in the secular-mendicant controversy provides a backdrop to the *Legenda major* in three ways: the question of mendicancy, the role of apocalypticism, and the significance of maintaining a good character by following the Rule. All three aspects played an important role in the intense disputes that raged at the University of Paris throughout the 1250s.[68]

Mendicancy

First, the seculars, led by William of Saint-Amour, challenged the mendicants' status within the University (1250–1254).[69] This, as the conflict progressed, morphed into a denial that mendicancy had apostolic legitimacy (1255–1259).[70] William championed the latter position with his *On the*

---

the very first sentence, the text instructs the reader/hearer to "learn by [Francis'] example (. . .) to live in conformity with Christ."

[68] *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* II, ed. Heinrich Denifle (Brussels: 1964); abbreviated CUP with number and page reference. Also see Palémon Glorieux, "Le conflict de 1252–7 à la lumière du mémoire de Guillaume de St. Amour," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 24 (1957): 364–372; Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: 1936), 376–391; Gordon Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (New York: 1968), 34–44; Michel-Marie Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la Polémique Universitaire Parisienne, 1250–1259* (Paris: 1972).

[69] Innocent IV subverted the uneasy truce between the seculars and mendicants since the 1220s by issuing *Super licentiandis* on 30 May 1250 (CUP n. 191, 219), which instructed the chancellor of Paris to license all qualified students, especially those belonging to religious orders, regardless of whether students had requested a license. In response, the seculars issued *Quoniam in promotione* in February 1252 (CUP, n. 200, 226–227), which attempted to limit the influence of the growing Dominican and Franciscan Orders. The decree attempted to limit mendicant influence in three ways: (1) no regular could be admitted to the *consortium magistrorum* without affiliation with a *studium* at Paris; (2) every religious order could only have one chair and one school; and (3) no religious bachelor could become a master unless he had studied at a recognized *studium* and lectured under the supervision of a regent master recognized by the seculars. The second point attempted to take one chair away from the Dominicans and prevented the Franciscans from attaining a second.

[70] The death of Innocent IV (7 December 1254) and the election of Alexander IV (7 December 1254), the Franciscan order's cardinal protector, brought a significant shift in

Dangers of the Last Times (*De periculis novissimorum temporum*).[71] Faced with a pro-mendicant pope and king, William first began to circulate drafts of *De periculis* after Alexander IV issued *Quasi lignum vitae* (14 April 1255).[72] He then published the first edition of *De periculis* after Louis IX mediated a compromise between the quarreling parties (1 March 1256).[73]

Many, if not all, of the forty-two signs that identify the mendicant orders as false preachers/apostles in the time of the Antichrist influence Bonaventure's writing of the *Legenda major*. Three examples (first, central, last signs) illustrate how the signs from *De periculis* shape Bonaventure's hagiography. The very first sign concerns associations with women.[74] Sensitive to this accusation, Bonaventure sanitizes Francis' relations with

---

the controversy. The new pope issued *Quasi lignum vitae* on 12 April 1255 (CUP I, n. 244, 276), which resolved every point of the secular-mendicant conflict in favor of the friars. It (1) overturns the ministerial decrees against the mendicants, (2) annuls the expulsion in July 1254 of the two Dominicans and orders their reintegration, (3) invalidates any limit on chairs held by mendicants, (4) gives the university chancellor the power to determine the number of chairs held by religious orders, and (5) limits the oath to obey university statutes required before becoming a master by making it binding according to a two-thirds majority. This gave the mendicant regulars significant power, because at any given time a third of the regents would have been regulars. The university statutes had to be observed, but according to the wishes of the mendicant regulars. Thus, business conducted by the consortium could proceed only with the support of the regulars. The extreme pro-mendicant tone of *Quasi lignum vitae* forced the seculars to change their strategy against the mendicants. It was not until four years later, on 5 April 1259, that Alexander IV issues *Intellecto Parisiense* (CUP I, n. 331, 381), which declares that some sort of peace had been reached between the seculars and mendicants.

[71] In all, William published five editions of *De periculis*. Geltner's text and English translation is that of the third redaction, the one Louis IX submitted to papal legates for examination, which was later condemned by Alexander IV at Angani on 5 October 1256 (*Romanus Pontifex* (CUP I, n. 288, 331). *William of Saint-Amour*: De periculis novissimorum temporum, ed., trans. and intro. Guy Geltner (Dallas Medieval Texts and Translation) 8 (Leuven: 2008).

[72] William's *libellus famosus* mentioned in *Radix amaritudinis* (CUP I, n. 256, 292–296) most likely refers to an early draft of *De periculis* that began to circulate in August/September in the aftermath of *Quasi lignum vitae* (CUP I, n. 247, 279).

[73] The compromise entitled *Noverit universitas vestra* (CUP I, n. 268, 304), involves three basic points: (1) The regulars can keep the current number of chairs, but cannot increase them; (2) regulars remain separate from the University until the seculars voluntarily agree to accept them; and (3) once admitted, regular regent masters have the same rights as secular regent masters. Angry that a compromise was reached without his approval, Alexander IV nullifies it on June 17 with *Cunctis processibus* (CUP I, n. 280, 319).

[74] *De periculis* 14.1, Geltner, *William*, 112–113; also cited in *De periculis* 2, Geltner, *William*, 48–49, 50–51. The friars "penetrate homes" (*penetrant domos*, 2 Tim. 3:1–8). For a fuller examination of the meaning of *penetrantes domos* within the eschatological context of 2 Tim. 3:1–8, see Penn Szittya, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton: 1986), 58–60.

women as reported in the earlier sources.[75] The twenty-first sign makes preaching combined with begging a form of simony; true apostles do not beg.[76] In contrast, Bonaventure presents begging for alms as a manifestation of Gospel perfection.[77] For God is the great Alsmsgiver.[78] The forty-second sign claims that true apostles do not seek friendships in this world. Accordingly Bonaventure presents Francis only as a friend of apostolic poverty so as to live in conformity with Christ.[79] These three examples illustrate how Bonaventure carefully presents Francis and his order in ways that contradict the many accusations of the seculars.[80] Yet, of the litany of signs, William mainly targets two contested privileges: preaching and confession. *De periculis* attempts to undermine them by questioning "the mendicants' dubious legal validity given the pope's undefined prerogative to create (and later protect) new ecclesiastical orders."[81] By way of

---

[75] Jacques Dalarun, *Francis of Assisi and the Feminine* (Saint Bonaventure: 2006), 223–234. For example, Bonaventure suppresses the story of Lady Jacoba at Francis' deathbed (3C 37–39) and its mention of a "special love" between them and Francis calling her "Brother Jacoba," which could be misconstrued by enemies of the order. Likewise, LMj 5.5 redacts 2C 112–114 to emphasize Francis' scarce associations with women. For example, 2C reports that Francis only knew two women by sight, and Bonaventure redacts such familiarity to read, "he recognized no woman's face." Hence, I do not entirely agree with Dalarun that "The rationale behind the re-write seems, for the most part, based on political choices, predominantly due to the Order's internal conflicts." The motivation is certainly political, but their source may lie outside the order, i.e., to the threat of the seculars' attacks.

[76] *De periculis* 14.21, Geltner, *William*, 126–127.

[77] LMj 7.6–12.

[78] LMj 7.10.

[79] LMj prol. 1 and 3.1; also see, LMj 2.4, 9.1, 9.4–5, 9.9, 10.4, 11.14, 13.3, 15.1; in LMj 5.9, Francis also calls fire his friend. Only once does Bonaventure identify Francis with an earthly friend, an "old friend" known to Francis before his conversion in LMj 2.6.

[80] *De periculis* portrays the mendicant religion in an extremely negative light, verging on hyperbole. To summarize the signs, mendicants are: deceivers of simple men, who avoid correction, seek all forms of honor, preach without commission or permission, change established traditions, avoid manual labor, preach for human praise, are quarrelsome or dismissive, avoid tribulations and hardships, strive to please men, covet power, provoke scandals, desire lavish accommodations, accept unrepentant sinners, boast in miracles, revel in vainglory, defame enemies, compete against bishops, are boastful, replace faith with reason, and live carnally. William draws many of these characteristics from 2 Tim. 3:1–8.

[81] Geltner, *William*, 17–18, citation 18. For William (especially in ch. 2 of *De periculis*) bishops and parish priests make up the two orders of clerics, according to the categories found in Dionysius' *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* and *Celestial Hierarchy*. The perfect order of bishops, presbyters, and deacons derive from the twelve apostles. The inferior order of monks, laity, and catechumens derive from the seventy-two disciples (Lk. 10:1). God instituted only these two orders, which precludes the legitimate emergence of a third order, i.e., mendicant regulars; see Geltner, *William*, 16. Also see James Dawson, "William of St. Amour and the Apostolic Tradition," *Medieval Studies* 40 (1978): 223–238, esp. 235.

interpolation,[82] Bonaventure confronts the challenge by emphasizing that it was Innocent III himself, before the restriction of the Fourth Lateran Council, who "approved the rule, gave them a mandate to preach penance, and had small tonsures given to all the lay brothers, who were accompanying the servant of God, so that they could freely preach the word of God."[83] Bonaventure leaves no room for doubt that Francis' brothers preach because Christ's vicar told them to do so freely.[84] In short, William claims the mendicants are "not sent" (Rom 10:15, *non missi*);[85] Bonaventure responds that Christ's own vicar sent them.

Moreover, linked with Innocent III's approval of the Rule, Bonaventure, by way of another interpolation,[86] tells of the intervention of Cardinal John of St Paul, who, inspired by the Spirit, counseled the pope:

> If we refuse the request of this poor man as novel or too difficult, when all he asks is to be allowed to lead the Gospel life, we must be on our guard lest we commit an offense against Christ's Gospel. For if anyone says that there is something novel or irrational or impossible to observe in this man's desire to live according to the perfection of the Gospel, he would be guilty of blasphemy against Christ, the author of the Gospel.[87]

Anyone, especially the seculars, who questioned Francis' Gospel proposal is guilty of blasphemy against Christ. Bonaventure redacts his sources to

---

[82] Compare 2C 16–17, LJS 21, and LMj 3.10.

[83] LMj 3.10 (*Fontes*, 802; FA:ED 2, 548): *Approbavit regulam, dedit de poenitentia praedicanda mandatum et laicis fratribus omnibus, qui servum Dei fuerant comitati, fecit coronas parvulas fieri, ut verbum Dei libere praedicarent.* Innocent III approved the rule (LMj 3.10, 4.11), and Honorius III confirmed it (LMj 4.11).

[84] As has been explained by Congar, two fundamentally different models of ecclesiology underlie the secular criticisms and the mendicant responses; Yves Congar, "Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendicants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIII^{e} siècle et le début du XIV^{e}," *Archives d'histoire doctrinal et littéraire du moyen âge* 36 (1961): 35–151. Also see Dawson, "William," 236–238.

[85] *De periculis* 2, Geltner, *William*, 50–51, and 14.7, Geltner, *William*, 114–115 and 116–117.

[86] 1C 32 has John of St Paul encouraging Francis to accept a monastic life because he feared Francis' proposal was too difficult. In contrast, Bonaventure has John of St Paul arguing for the "perfection of the Gospel" over against other cardinals who viewed Francis' proposal as "something novel and difficult beyond human powers" (LMj 3.9.3: *novum aliquid et supra vires humanas*).

[87] LMj 3.9.5–6 (*Fontes*, 801; FA:ED 2, 547): *Si petitionem pauperis huius tamquam nimis arduam novamque refellimus, cum petat confirmari sibi formam evangelicae vitae, cavendum est nobis, ne in Christi Evangelium offendamus. Nam si quis intra evangelicae perfectionis observantiam et votum ipsius dicat contineri aliquid novum aut irrationabile vel impossibile ad servandum, contra Christum, Evangelii auctorem, blasphemare convincitur.*

support his interpretation against the seculars who claimed "evangelical perfection" was impossible.[88]

Apocalypticism

Second, the genre of *De periculis* introduces the aspect of apocalypticism. Both parties charged their arguments with apocalyptic imagery: William's *De periculis* (1255) and Gerard of Borgo San Donnino's *Introduction to the Eternal Gospel* (1254, *Introductorius in evangelium aeternum*). Both were condemned by Alexander IV within a year of each other.[89] Even though the *Introductorius* was devastatingly inimical to the mendicant cause,[90] Humbert of Romans and John of Parma nevertheless issued a joint encyclical letter, *Salvator saeculi* (1255),[91] describing the Dominicans and Franciscans along apocalyptic lines. The joint encyclical informs the apocalyptic imagery in the *Legenda major*'s prologue.[92] Like the encyclical Bonaventure opens the prologue by citing Tit. 2:11: "*The grace of God our Savior has appeared in these last days* in his servant Francis."[93] But Bonaventure's imagery goes beyond the encyclical by also associating

---

[88] At the risk of reading too much into the text, Bonaventure's concern over the secular attacks lends itself to ulterior meanings behind Sylvester's conversion account (LMj 3.5). For Sylvester, a secular priest who had an abhorrence for Francis and his brothers, saw in a dream a huge dragon attacking Assisi, but he then beheld a golden cross issuing from Francis' mouth that defeated the dragon. Afterwards, Sylvester left the world and followed Christ's footsteps by joining the order. Is it mere coincidence that Francis' sixth disciple (sixth age) is a secular priest who detests mendicancy and has a vision of a dragon (Antichrist, Dan. 14:22; Rev. 12:3) that is defeated by Christ's cross (Rev. 1:16, 19:15)? Note that Bonaventure adds details to the account not found in 2C 109: the dragon, Sylvester's contuition, and the validation of the vision via a triple repetition. Bonaventure also redacts the story by generalizing Sylvester's grievance with Bernard to an abhorrence for the ways of the brothers.

[89] On 23 October 1255, Alexander IV condemns the *Liber introductorium in evangelium aeternum* with *Libellum quemdam* (CUP I, n. 257, 297). The next year, on 5 October 1256, Alexander IV condemns *De periculis novissimorum temporum* with *Romanus Pontifex* (CUP I, n. 288, 331). Ironically, both were condemned for a similar reason. Gerard predicted the end of the church's hierarchy, and William attacked both the royal and papal hierarchies. In effect, as with all apocalyptic literature, both authors called for change to the *status quo*, resulting in their condemnations.

[90] William mentions the *Introductorius* several times in the *De periculis* 8.

[91] *Annales minorum* 3, pp. 380–383.

[92] Luigi Pellegrini, "Il ruolo 'profetico' di Francisco d'Assisi: Analisi sincronica del prologo della 'Legenda Major,'" in *Francescanesimo e profezia* (Rome: 1985), 361–395, esp. 368–369 n. 11 where Pellegrini highlights the textual correspondence between *Salvator saeculi* and the opening lines of the *Legenda major*. Also see Fernando Uribe, *Il Francesco di Bonaventura: Lettura della Leggenda Maggiore* (Assisi, 2003): 21–23.

[93] LMj prol. 1.1 (*Fontes*, 777; FA:ED 2, 525): *Apparuit gratia Dei Salvatoris nostri diebus istis novissimis in Servo suo Francisco.*

Francis with eschatological figures:[94] John the Baptist, Christ's forerunner, Elijah who will appear before Christ comes again, and the angel of the sixth seal who will mark God's elect before the final judgment.[95]

By presenting the *Legenda major* within an apocalyptic framework, Bonaventure intentionally responds to the radical apocalypticism threatening the order from two fronts. On one side, he had to address the attacks found in William's *De periculis*, which denied that the mendicants' "new order" (*novus ordo*) was legitimate.[96] On the other side, he had to address apocalyptic ideas that threatened the order from within. While the seculars thought evangelical perfection was impossible, Joachimite elements within the Franciscan order believed that the *Eternal Gospel* would soon replace the Old Testament (Father) and the New Testament (Son) with the dawning of the Spirit's "third status" (*tertius status*) in 1260.[97] In short, the "new dispensation" (*nova dispositio*) brought with it a "new order" (*novus ordo*) led by mendicants, that is, the "spiritual men" (*viri spirituales*).[98] Gerard's interpretation of the *tertius status* led to his condemnation and probably to the removal of John of Parma as minister general in 1257.

---

[94] In Mk. 9:11–13, Mt. 17:10–13, and Lk. 1:17 Jesus links the figures of John and Elijah together. Although using different imagery, Thomas of Celano already interpreted Francis along eschatological lines: 1C 89, 2C 71, 141, 155, 156, 220.

[95] As with the other triads within prol. 1, the three figures represent the triple way of purgation (John), illumination (Elijah), and perfection (angel). The other triads include LMj prol. 1.1.1: reject worldly passions (purgation), live in conformity with Christ (illumination), and thirst after hope with unending desire (perfection); prol. 1.1.2: lifted from worldly life (purgation), light of Gospel perfection (illumination), and prepare a way of peace (perfection); 1.1.3: darkness (purgation), light (illumination), glory (perfection); 1.1.6: grace (purgation), virtue and prophecy (illumination), angelic office and seraphic fire (perfection); see Fernando Uribe, who interprets the triads in a similar manner, but without recognizing the parallel between the three figures and the triple way (*Il Francesco di Bonaventura*, 25 and 40–41 nn. 51–52). Because of this threefold activity, Bonaventure calls Francis a hierarchic man (*vir hierarchicus*), a technical term Bonaventure employs to describe the soul's reformation back into its true state as an image of God through and in the influence of grace; see *Breviloquium* 6.1 (5, 252).

[96] See note 69 and related text.

[97] Joachim's three major works would replace the two Testaments, thereby constituting an *evangelium aeternum*: *Liber de Concordia novi et veteris Testamenti*, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, and *Psalterium decem chordarum.*

[98] In *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford: 1969), 187–189, Marjorie Reeves suggests that there were three main points in Gerard's *Introductorius*: 1) the proclamation of the third *status* of the Holy Spirit, 2) the declaration that about the year 1200 the Spirit left the two Testaments and was replaced by the Eternal Gospel, and 3) the assertion that the Eternal Gospel was entrusted to a barefoot mendicant order, i.e., the Franciscans, who supplanted the established orders in the church. In making these claims, Gerard is following the pseudo-Joachimite commentary *Super Hieremiam Prophetam*, which began to circulate among Franciscans in the 1240s.

Before Bonaventure replaced John of Parma as the new minister general, he responded to William's *De periculis* and Gerard's *Introductorius* with his *Quaestiones disputatae de perfectione evangelica* (fall 1255).[99] The former denied that absolute poverty had a scriptural basis, and the latter claimed that such poverty was the only authentic possibility in the *tertius status*.[100] Overtly, Bonaventure disputes William, who accused the mendicants of a "self-love" that seeks their own glory more than God's,[101] by commencing the *De perfectione evangelica* with the claim that complete subjection of oneself for the love of Christ is the foundation of all Christian perfection (qu. 1).[102] Covertly, Bonaventure also rejects Gerard's claim that Christ's Gospel will be surpassed by the *Eternal Gospel* in the "third age" of the church by arguing for the Gospel perfection exemplified by Christ (qu. 1).[103] In short, Bonaventure argues for Gospel perfection over against any form of Gospel supersession.

---

[99] In fact, Bonaventure never mentions William by name, but a comparison of William's writings and Bonaventure's during the period shows that they were engaged in a dispute. In July/August, William circulates a "first draft" of *De periculis novissimorum temporum.* In September, Bonaventure begins *De perfectione evangelica* with qu. 1 *De humilitate*. He continues the disputation into October with qu. 2 *De Paupertate*, which was written during back-and-forth responses between William and Bonaventure. The last two questions on chastity and obedience were likely finished by the end of the term in December. A detailed chronology is outlined in Michel-Marie Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne, 1250–1259* (Paris: 1972), 174–180; Jacques-Guy Bougerol, "De La *Reportatio* a La *Reactio*," in *Les Genres Littéraires dans les Sources Théologiques et Philosophiques Médiévales* (Louvain: 1981), 56–57; and Andrew Traver, *The* Opuscula *of William of Saint-Amour: The Minor Works of 1255–1256* (Münster: 2003), 6–29. Although Decima Douie incorrectly dates the *De perfectione evangelica* to 1256, she nevertheless provides a good overview of Bonaventure's arguments, see "St Bonaventura's Part in the Conflict Between Seculars and Mendicants at Paris," in *S. Bonaventurura, 1274–1974*, vol. 2, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol et al. (Grottaferrata: 1973), 585–612.

[100] Bernard McGinn, "Apocalyptic Traditions and Spiritual Identity in Thirteenth-Century Religious Life," in *Roots of the Modern Christian Tradition*, ed. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: 1984), 11; and "Joachim of Fiore's *Tertius Status*: Some Theological Appraisals," in *L'età dello Spirito e la fine dei tempi in Gioacchino da Fiore e nel Gioachimismo medieval*, ed. Antonio Crocco (Fiore: 1986), 217–236. Also see Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 188.

[101] *De periculis* 2, Geltner, *William*, 46–47, 48–49.

[102] The first fruit of such humble subjection is poverty (qu. 2), chastity follows (qu. 3), and obedience, especially to Rome (in contrast to the seculars), ends the disputation (qu. 4). The *De perfectione evangelica* reflects its apocalyptic context. Of particular importance is the question of poverty (qu. 2), especially begging (qu. 2, a. 2), which William specifically attacked. Therein Bonaventure identifies mendicants as the *viri spirituales*, defends the mendicant notion of absolute poverty, and claims the mendicants are those who bear the seal of the living God upon their foreheads; for a fuller analysis see Robert Karris, *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection* (Saint Bonaventure: 2008), 14–20.

[103] At the outset of the conclusion to qu. 1, Bonaventure writes (5, 210): "the height of all Christian perfection depends on humility (. . .). For the height of all Christian perfection

The *De perfectione evangelica* influenced Bonaventure's understanding of that term in the *Legenda major*.[104] Therein Bonaventure uses the term "evangelical perfection" seven times,[105] more than any earlier hagiographical source.[106] It appears at key points within the text: the prologue identifies Francis as "a practitioner, leader and herald of Gospel perfection." Ch. 1, which begins the "historical narrative," ends by associating the acceptance of Christ's cross with Gospel perfection. Ch. 3 on the founding of the religious order calls Francis a "model of Gospel perfection," and, as already shown, Innocent III's approval of Francis' proposal includes John of St Paul's warning that a denial of Gospel perfection is blasphemy against Christ.[107] Ch. 7 on poverty lists poverty, chastity, and obedience as the elements of Gospel perfection, a clear borrowing from *De perfectione evangelica*. Ch. 13, as an *inclusio* with the historical narrative from ch. 1, identifies Francis' stigmata with "the summit of Gospel perfection." Finally, ch. 15 concludes the text by naming Francis as "the exemplar of all Gospel perfection."[108] In effect, Bonaventure primarily associates Gospel perfection with three interrelated things: the Rule, Poverty, and Christ crucified/stigmata.

---

revolves around three points, namely, grace, justice, and wisdom, according to the three things that Christ is said to be: the way, the truth, and the life (…). When these are perfectly acquired, one ascends to the pinnacle of evangelical perfection that Christ Jesus taught by word and example."

[104] Jacques Guy Bougerol, "Francesco, guida alla perfezione evangelica secondo la *Legenda major* di Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 30 (1983): 11–27. Sophronius Clasen claims that Bonaventure redacted the earlier hagiographical sources according to the arguments of *De perfectione evangelica*: see "La *Legenda maior* s. Francisci di s. Bonaventura," *Incontri Bonaventuriani* 10 (1974): pp. 49–65, esp. 51–52.

[105] LMj prol. 1.9, 1.6.17, 3.2.1, 3.9.13, 7.6.11, 13.10.21, 15.1.5. Bonaventure employs the term once in the LMn 2.5.3.

[106] Of the sources that Bonaventure employs in writing the LMj, 1–3C never uses the term "evangelical perfection," and LJS uses it three times: 15, 16, 73. Two other sources use the phrase: L3C (25, 39, 48) and AP (33, 46). It is interesting to note that Thomas of Celano does not incorporate the term, even though he knew all the mentioned sources as he compiled 2C.

[107] See note 87 and related text.

[108] Overall Bonaventure refers to the Gospel or to the act of evangelizing sixty-eight times and to various grammatical forms of perfection fifty-two times. For example, LMj 1.1 opens by stating that Francis was no "deaf hearer of the Gospel," for he had "perfectly put on Christ." Many other times, the two terms relate to each other within the same narrative, especially within chs. 3 and 7, i.e., (1) on founding of the religion and the approval of the Rule and (2) on Francis' love of poverty, which reflect the same two issues from the secular-mendicant controversy.

Following the Rule

Third, Bonaventure's involvement in the secular-mendicant controversy surely taught him two things: (1) the "good reputation" of the order was closely scrutinized and could become tarnished very quickly, and (2) not all the accusations of the seculars were groundless, for some brothers were living in ways that undermined the Rule. On the one hand, the fallout from the ill-fated *Evangelium aeternum* bolstered the secular cause and altered papal support for both mendicant orders. Mendicancy now faced charges of heresy. Secular attempts to link the two were successful. For Innocent IV, previously a supporter of mendicant pastoral and educational activities, issued three letters that curtailed mendicant privileges: *Lecta coram* (10 May 1254), *Quotiens pro communi* (4 July 1254), and *Esti animarum* (21 November 1254).[109] Innocent IV's reversal of policy made the mendicants subservient to secular ecclesiastics, whereas his earlier intervention had previously enabled them to be the seculars' competitors.[110] In effect, the seculars gained the upper hand: mendicant ministries (e.g., preaching, confession, burial, etc.) were placed under direct local diocesan control, and mendicant academics were required to adhere to all University statutes. In the course of six short months, the mendicants watched as their papal support vanished. Missteps proved grave.

However, just as quickly as the mendicants lost papal support, they regained it after the death of Innocent IV (7 December 1254) and the election of Alexander IV (7 December 1254), the Franciscan order's cardinal protector. The new pope quickly repealed *Esti animarum* with *Nec insolitum* (22 December),[111] and four short months later, he issued *Quasi lignum vitae* (12 April 1255), which resolved every point of the secular-mendicant conflict in favor of the friars.[112] Within a single year the mendicants lost and regained papal support. The see-saw illustrates just how precarious the mendicant orders' role and status within the Church could be. Their

---

[109] *Lecta coram* (CUP I, n. 236, 263), places pastoral restrictions upon mendicant privileges; *Quotiens pro communi* (CUP I, n. 237, 265), orders that all university statutes must be observed by mendicants (the same position as the secular's earlier *Nos universitas*); and *Etsi animarum* (CUP I, n. 240, 267–70) stripped the mendicants of ministerial privileges granted by previous popes.

[110] See note 68 and related text. On 30 May 1250, Innocent IV issued *Super licentiandis*, which subverted the uneasy truce between the seculars and mendicants by instructing the chancellor of Paris to license all qualified students, especially those belonging to religious orders, regardless of whether students had requested a license (CUP, n. 191, 219).

[111] CUP I, n. 244, 276.

[112] CUP I, n. 244, 276.

growth or ruin depended on maintaining a good reputation by living the Rule they professed.

The scrutiny of the seculars was also shared by others like the Dominicans, some of whom spoke negatively about the Franciscans. Such inter-fraternal scrutiny provides the occasion for Bonaventure's *Letter in Response to Three Questions of an Unknown Master*,[113] which addresses three questions regarding the Franciscan observance of the Rule: poverty, manual labor, and educated brothers, especially masters.[114] These three questions, voiced by the seculars too, impact how Bonaventure portrays the same issues in the *Legenda major*.

Bonaventure mentions poverty one-hundred and sixty-seven times in the *Legenda major*.[115] The prologue's opening sentence mentions "holy poverty."[116] Francis' initial conversion ends with him embracing poverty,[117] and his "perfect conversion" has "the true lover of poverty" renouncing all his possessions before the bishop of Assisi.[118] The founding of the religious order finds Francis understanding the "Gospel form of life" to involve the combination of poverty with the preaching of penance and peace.[119] The confirmation of the Rule has Bonaventure proclaiming that "Holy poverty, which was all they had to meet their expenses, made them prompt for

[113] *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus ad magistrum innominatum* (8, 331–336). For a translation and general discussion of the letter, see Monti, *Writings*, 39–56.

[114] *Opera omnia* 8, 331. The three references to the Later Rule are: poverty (4.1, 6.1), manual labor (5.1), and education (10.7).

[115] Compare poverty (167, *pauper/pauperculus/paupertas*) to other key words used to describe the Franciscan way of life: charity (30, *caritas*), love (90, *am amor*), desire (52, *diligo/desiderio/desiderium*), humility (101, *humilis/humilitas/humilitate/humiliter*), preaching (58, *praedicatio/sermo*), compassion (19, *misericordia*), devotion (104, *devotio/devotus*), obedience (46, *obedio/obediens/obedientia*), prayer/meditation/contemplation (80, *oratio/meditatio/contemplatio*), and Gospel (85, *evangelicus/evangelicum*). Adding mendicancy (11, *mendicitas/mendico/mendicus*) and alms (20, *eleemosyna*) to poverty raises the number of occurrences to 198. Finally, poverty is mentioned more frequently than cross, crucifixion, and references to the stigmata, which are elemental to the *Legenda major*'s theology.

[116] See note 157 for the Latin text.

[117] LMj 1.6.

[118] LMj 2.4.

[119] LMj 3.1–2. Bonaventure alters three significant aspects of the earlier 1C version: (1) Francis was hearing the Gospel at "a mass of the Apostles," which made him a "friend of apostolic poverty." (2) Like the apostles who understood Jesus' instructions to his disciples, Francis immediately understands the Gospel directive. Accordingly, Bonaventure deletes the priest's explanation of the Gospel to Francis. (3) Poverty enables Francis "to conform in every way to the rule of right living given to the apostles." In effect, Bonaventure's redaction of 1C emphasizes that mendicancy reflects the form of life Christ gave to the twelve apostles.

every obedience, robust for work, and free for travel."[120] By way of an interpolation not found in the earlier sources, Bonaventure tells of a Saracen who "offered to minister to all their needs."[121] The story is a not so veiled example of *usus pauper*,[122] which Bonaventure concludes by proclaiming: "O ineffable value of poverty, whose marvelous power moved the fierce heart of a barbarian to such sweet pity! What a horrible and unspeakable crime that a Christian should trample upon this noble pearl which a Saracen held in such veneration!"[123] No doubt Bonaventure had the seculars and like-minded critics in mind as he added this interpolation.

Via two other interpolations, Bonaventure also quotes Francis as (1) claiming poverty as the way to salvation: "You know, brothers, that poverty is the special way to salvation, as the stimulus of humility and the root of perfection, whose fruit is many, but hidden. For this is the hidden treasure of the Gospel field; to buy it, everything must be sold, and, in comparison, everything that cannot be sold must be spurned."[124] And (2) gospel poverty is the foundation of the order: "This, he used to say, was the foundation of his Order, on which primary substratum the structure of religion rests, so that it is strengthened by its strength, and weakened by the weakness of its base."[125] Hence, anyone entering the order must obey the Gospel precept: "If you wish to be perfect, go, sell all that you have, and give to the poor."[126] A precept that Bernard, Francis' first companion,

---

[120] LMj 4.7.2 (*Fontes*, 808; FA:ED 2, 554): *Faciebat namquam sancta paupertas, quam solam deferebant pro sumptibus, ipsos ad omnem obedientiam promptos, robustos ad labores et ad itinera expeditos.*

[121] LMj 4.7.7 (*Fontes*, 808; FA:ED 2, 555): *ut offerret se ad ministrandum necessaria omnia.*

[122] In the *Letter to an Unknown Master* 6, Bonaventure argues that brothers can use things provided by benefactors, but they cannot own them (8, 333).

[123] LMj 4.7.8–9 (*Fontes*, 808; FA:ED 2, 555): *O inaestimabilis pretiositas paupertatis, cuius miranda virtute mens feritatis barbaricae in tantam miserationis est immutata dulcedinem! Horrendum proinde ac nefarium scelus, ut hanc margaritam nobilem vir christianus conculcet, quam tanta veneration extulit Saracenus.* Five other times Bonaventure identifies poverty with the "pearl of the Gospel" (LMj 1.4.5, 4.7.22, 11.14.14, 7.1.9, 15.5.8).

[124] LMj 7.1.9–10 (*Fontes*, 833; FA:ED 2, 578): *Paupertatem noveritis, fratres, specialem viam esse salutis tamquam humilitatis fomentum perfectionisque radicem, cuius est fructus multiplex, sed occultus. Haec enim est evangelici agri thesaurus absconditus, pro quo emendo vendenda sunt omnia, et quae vendi non possunt illius comparatione spernenda.*

[125] LMj 7.2.7 (*Fontes*, 834; FA:ED 2, 578): *Hanc sui dicebat Ordinis fundamentum, cui substrato primarie sic omnis structura religionis innititur, ut ipsius firmitate firmetur et eversione funditus evertatur.* In LMj 6.1, Bonaventure also identifies humility as the foundation.

[126] LMj 7.3.1 (*Fontes*, 834; FA:ED 2, 579): *Si vis perfectus esse, vade, vende omnia, quae habes, et da pauperibus* (Mt. 19:21). The next sentence makes an important association: "And therefore, only those who had given up everything and kept away all possessions and retained absolutely nothing did [Francis] admit to the Order, both because of the

originally accepted.[127] In short, Francis was offended by any brother who shunned poverty,[128] and rejoiced at the time of his death because "he had kept faith until the end with Lady Poverty."[129]

As to the question of manual labor, Bonaventure follows his earlier explanation in the *Letter to an Unknown Master*: Manual labor is a remedy against idleness, "the cesspool of all evil thoughts."[130] Accordingly, the earlier legends have Francis calling his body "brother ass" because he subjected it to heavy labor in order to overcome the laziness of the flesh. Likewise, he called idle people "brother fly" because they poisoned the good done by others. To emphasize the point, Bonaventure directly cites 2C 161: "I want my brothers to work and be kept busy, lest, given to idleness, they stray into what is forbidden with heart and tongue."[131] In short, Bonaventure presents two values of manual labor: (1) it helps "brother ass" defeat idleness, and (2) it prevents "brother fly" from being a burden upon others. Nevertheless, the prohibition against laziness appears to be more pronounced, for at the end of his life, Francis "burned with a great desire" to return to the work of caring for lepers so that love could overcome apathy and laziness of both body and spirit.[132]

As to the question of educated brothers, Bonaventure uses the term "teacher" eleven times: *magister* seven and *doctor* four times.[133] Nine of these passages identify Christ as the Gospel teacher who taught Francis humility by word and example (cites Lk 16:16). Francis is never called teacher. Instead, Francis' disciples, the Lesser Brothers, enrolled in "the

---

words the holy Gospel and because they should not cause scandal by keeping a money bag (*loculi*)." (*ideoque nonnisi expropriatos et nihil penitus retinentes admittebat ad Ordinem, tum propter verbum sancti Evangelii, tum etiam ne forent in scandalum loculi reservati*). Those who withhold possessions are like Judas who betrayed Christ.

[127] LMj 3.3.2.

[128] LMj 7.1.4.

[129] LMj 14.4.3.

[130] LMj 5.6.1 (*Fontes*, 817; FA:ED 2, 564): *Otium autem omnium malarum cogitationum semitam docebat summopere fugiendum.*

[131] LMj 5.6.2–4 (*Fontes*, 817–818; FA:ED 2, 564): *fratrem asinum (. . .) fratrem muscam (. . .). Volo fratres meos laborare et exercitari, ne otio dediti, per illicit corde aut lingua vagentur.*

[132] LMj 14.1.4 (*Fontes*, 899; FA:ED 2, 640): *Flagrabat etiam desiderio magno* (Mt. 2:10).

[133] *Magister*: LMj 6.1 (x2), 6.5, 7.8, 8.7, 11.1, 12.2. LMj 8.7 calls the lamb Francis gave to Lady Jacoba a "teacher of devotion" (*magister devotionis*). *Doctor*: LMj 2.1, 11.2 (x2), 11.14. LMj 11.2 mentions the doctor of sacred theology (*theologiae sacrae doctore*) whom Francis taught the scriptures since he "held their *doctorem* in his heart." Interestingly, in a manner reminiscent of *Letter to an Unknown Master* 13 (8, 336), Bonaventure ends the chapter on Francis' understanding of scripture by stating that Christ is "the exalted Teacher" (*Doctor excelsus*) of simple men: David a shepherd, Peter a fisherman, and Francis a merchant who sold all he had to purchase the pearl of the Gospel.

school of the humble Christ to learn humility" from "the teacher of humility" (cites Mt. 20:26). It is Christ, "the Teacher of the Gospel," who taught the Lesser Brothers to beg for alms (cites Mt. 25:40). In a passage that directly addresses the education of the brothers, Bonaventure reports by way of an extended interpolated quotation from Francis:[134]

> Once, when the brothers asked him whether he was pleased that the learned men, who, by that time, had been received into the Order, were devoting themselves to the study of sacred Scripture, he replied: "I am indeed pleased, as long as, after the example of Christ, of whom we read that he prayed more than he read, they do not neglect zeal for prayer; and, as long as they study, not to know what they should say, but to practice what they have heard and, once they have put it into practice, propose it to others. I want my brothers," he said, "to be Gospel disciples and spin knowledge of the truth that they increase in pure simplicity without separating the simplicity of the dove from the wisdom of the serpent which our eminent Teacher joined together in a statement from his own blessed lips.[135]

Like Christ, prayer should inform study; action and knowledge should flow from study, and "Gospel disciples" should learn both simplicity and wisdom from their study. Via an interpolated quotation from Francis, Bonaventure presents all three as united by Christ, the preeminent Teacher. Hence, the brothers, following Francis, can advance in learning, but Christ ever remains their teacher.

The long quotation also contains the significant phrase, "propose it to others." The last occurrence of "teacher" in the *Legenda major* does just that. Bonaventure presents Francis as struggling over whether to remain in prayer or go out among the crowds to preach.[136] Via a heavy redaction/interpolation of 1C 91,[137] the *Legenda major* supplies two interrelated

---

[134] The interpolation is a heavily redacted compilation derived from 2C 102, 163, 189, 194 and 195.

[135] LMj 11.1.4–6 (*Fontes*, 869–870; FA:ED 2, 612–613): *Quaerentibus aliquando fratribus, utrum sibi placeret quod litterati iam recepti ad Ordinem intenderent studio sacrae Scripturae respondit: Mihi quidem placet, dum tamen exemplo Christi, qui magis orasse legitur quam legisse, orationis stadium non omittant, nec tantum student, ut sciant qualiter debeant loqui, sed ut audita faciant, et cum fecerint, aliis facienda proponent. Volo, inquit, fratres meos discipulos evangelicos esse sicque in notitia veritatis proficere, quod in simplicitatis puritate concrescant, ut simplicitatem columbinam a prudentia serpentina* (Mt. 10:16) *non separent, quas Magister eximius ore suo benedicto coniunxit.*

[136] See footnote 228 and related text.

[137] The literary contexts of 1C 91 and LMj 12.2 differ. Thomas mentions Francis' highest philosophy and desire near the beginning of the second book, right before the vision of the seraph. Bonaventure keeps some of the phraseology in describing Francis' desire for perfectly fulfilling God's good pleasure, but the context shifts to Francis' preaching activity.

goals: (1) Francis decides to preach through the corroborating counsel of Sylvester and Clare, and (2) "Although he had learned great things from the supreme Teacher," Francis' "highest philosophy" and "highest desire" was to ask others "how he could more effectively arrive at the summit of perfection."[138] While Christ remains the supreme Teacher, Francis also learned from others, which Bonaventure identifies as Francis' "highest philosophy."[139] Very subtly, Bonaventure permits the study of philosophy, if, as with Francis, it advances the vocation of preaching the Gospel, the summit of perfection.[140]

A final piece of evidence that relates to the order's good reputation by living the Rule comes from Bonaventure's *First Encyclical Letter* (23 April 1257). Therein, Bonaventure identifies ten abuses confronting the order. Seven specifically deal with poverty: handling of money, seeking bodily comforts, pushy begging, lavish buildings, aggressive acquisition of burial fees and legacies, expensive changes of brothers' residences, and excessive general expenses. The other three concern idleness, familiarities with women, and imprudent assignment of ministerial offices (i.e., preaching and confession). Many of these abuses reflect the accusations hurled at the Franciscans by the seculars. Hence, Bonaventure recognizes that, "the dangers still threatening our Order, the wounds being inflicted on the consciences of many brothers, not to mention the scandals being given to secular persons, for whom our Order, which ought to be a shinning mirror of sanctity, has become in many parts of the world an object of loathing and contempt."[141] In keeping with the mirror imagery, Bonaventure explains that the reputation of the order has been tarnished from without by scandals and tainted from within by dimmed consciences. Bonaventure's solution to the ten problems is singular: follow the Rule. Adherence to the Rule will bring two reciprocal outcomes: avoiding scandal and attaining salvation.[142]

---

[138] LMj 12.2.1–3 (*Fontes*, 880–881; FA:ED 2, 623): *qui magna didicerat a Magistro supremo (. . .). summa eius philosophia, hoc summum eius desiderium exstitit (. . .) qualiter ad perfectionis culmen virtuosius pervenire valeret.*

[139] LMj 12.2.3 is the only occurrence of *philosophia* throughout the entire text.

[140] Bonaventure presents the same line of thought in *The Letter to an Unknown Master* and *Christ the One Teacher of All.*

[141] *Epistola* 1, 1.1 (8, 468; Monti, *Writings*, 59): *Nunc autem, quia pericula temporum urgent et laesiones conscientiarum nec non et scandalum mundanorum, quibus, cum Ordo deberet esse sanctitatis totius speculum, in diversis orbis partibus in taedium vertitur et contemptum.*

[142] *Epistola* 1, n. 5 (8, 469; Monti, *Writings*, 62): "avoiding scandal, we might observe the Rule we have vowed; if we do not observe it, we cannot be saved" [*vitatis scandalis, ut tenemur, Regulae, quam vovimus, sine cuius observatione salvari non possumus*].

As I have shown,[143] many of the specific concerns voiced in the *First Encyclical Letter* impact the *Legenda major.* However, something else also concerns the new minister general, the overall reputation of Francis and his order. The main problem, the behavior of any of the brothers implicates all the brothers.[144] Hence, such "lukewarm and halfhearted brothers" are "inflicting severe damage on the Order."[145] In light of his overarching concern for the order's reputation, Bonaventure redacts the earlier sources in two interrelated ways: (1) he drastically reduces references in 1–2C that describe and/or predict corruption within the order,[146] which (2) reverses Thomas of Celano's depiction of the order's growth as a sign of its demise, by making it a sign of God's blessing.[147] Only with Francis' blessing of the brothers at the time of his death does Bonaventure incorporate Francis' prediction of future trials and tribulations: "Good bye, all my sons, in the fear of the Lord and remain in Him always. Because a trial and tribulation is coming in the future, happy are they who will persevere in those things they have begun."[148] However, the inclusion does not implicate the order, for the tribulation could as easily refer to the seculars' attacks or other events threatening the order. The non-specificity encourages the hearer/reader to remain vigilant by preserving and enacting Francis' *religio*. Moreover, the issues of the secular-mendicant controversy were not simply in the near past. Rather, the election of the less-than-sympathetic Urban IV

---

[143] See notes 74, 113 and 130: e.g., poverty, women, begging, idleness, etc.

[144] *Epistola* 1, n. 3 (8, 469; Monti, *Writings*, 60).

[145] *Epistola* 1, n. 3 (8, 469; Monti, *Writings*, 60): *in maximum et nullo modo dissimulandum vergant nostri Ordinis detrimentum, licet tepidis et indevotis.*

[146] For example: 1C 28, 74 (both deleted from LJS) and 104 (heavily redacted in LJS to remove negativity); 2C 23–24 (story of the black hen), 25, 32–33, 70, 82, 149, 162, 174, 179–80, 188, 193, 209, 216. It is important to note that 2C also redacted the material collected after the 1244 Genoa General Chapter, especially potentially negative episodes that contrast Francis' form of life with later developments in the order, see Raoul Manselli, Nos qui cum eo fuimus: *Contributo alla questione francescana* (Rome: 1980), 163–208.

[147] For example, 1C 28, 2C 23, 70, 82, 156–158, 162, 179, 188, 209, 216. Giovanni Miccoli argues that 2C presents the Order's growth as a sign of its corruption in "Di alcuni passi di san Bonaventura sullo sviluppo dell'ordine francescano," *Studi medievali* 11 (1970): 381ff., esp. 394–395. He follows the same line of thought in *Francesco d'Assisi: Realtà e memoria di un'esperienza cristiana* (Turin: 1991), 276–277. Also see Théophile Desbonnets, *From Intuition to Institution*: *The Franciscans* (Chicago: 1988), 133–141. The context of 1257–1261 suggests that Bonaventure changes the narrative of "growth as corruption" to "growth as blessing" to thwart attempts by external enemies to undermine the order and its pastoral activities. The editorial perspective attempts to avoid the assertion that the Franciscans are corrupt because Francis himself said they would be corrupt.

[148] LMj 14.5.4–5 (*Fontes*, 903; FA:ED 2, 643): *Valete, filii omnes, in timore Domini et permanete in eo simper. Et quoniam futura tentatio et tribulation appropinquat, felices, qui perseverabunt in his quae coeperunt.* Compare 1C109 and 2C 216.

(29 August 1261), a secular graduate of Paris, gave the upper hand back to the seculars, who soon began to curtail mendicant privileges at the University, culminating in Gerard of Abbeville's resumed attack on evangelical poverty with *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae* (1269).

Hagiographical Context

Within a contentious context that questioned the ecclesiastical status of the Lesser Brothers, Bonaventure, at the request of his brothers, worked toward incorporating Francis into the liturgical life of the order and the church. The sheer volume of material about Francis prior to Bonaventure's commission made the task a daunting one.[149] However, computer analysis of all the Franciscan hagiographical sources that predate Bonaventure reveal how he limited and controlled his sources.[150] Bonaventure only used the three works of Thomas of Celano (1C, 2C, 3C) and that of Julian of Speyer (LJS) to compose the *Legenda major*. [151] Only two episodes from ch. 4, (1) the Portiuncula Chapter and (2) Francis' rewriting of the Rule, appear in earlier hagiographical sources that do not also appear in the works of either Thomas of Celano or Julian of Speyer.[152] Although the earlier *The Anonymous of Perugia and The Legend of the Three Companions*

---

[149] Note that during the period between the 1257 Chapter of Rome and the 1263 Chapter of Pisa, Bonaventure oversaw the compilation/redaction/correction of the order's liturgical texts, the order's Constitutions, the lives of St Francis, and a concise theology manual to help train the brothers in their pastoral care duties. All were at the request of the brothers. With the *Brevioloquium*, Bonaventure not only redacted the size but also tailored the text to the needs of the intended audience. The same is true of the *Legenda major.*

[150] Daniele Solvi, *Officina Franciscana: Testi, Sinossi e Indici delle Fonti Francescane*, vol. 1 (Florence: 2005), 202–237.

[151] Any apparent references to Thomas' *Legenda ad usum chori* (LCh) can be traced back to 1C. Computer analysis confirms what the editors of the *Analecta* argued without the aid of a text-database; see *Analecta Franciscana* 10, lxvi–lxvii. In effect, Bonaventure only utilizes the earlier "official" hagiographical tradition. For the distinction between the "official" and "unofficial" traditions, see Raoul Manselli, "Agiografia francescana tra interpretazione teologica e religiosità popolare," in *Agiografia nell'occidente cristiano. Secoli XIII–XV* (Rome: 1980). This is in contrast to, for example, Jacques Dalarun and Giovanni Miccoli, who claim that Bonaventure utilized 1–3C and LJS as well as *The Anonymous of Perugia*, *The Legend of the Three Companions*, and *The Assisi Compilation* (i.e., Legend of Perugia). Yet, the textual data strongly suggests that Bonaventure only had access to these texts via 2C, or that he had access but intentionally ignored them. Either way, realization that Bonaventure used only the "official" sources frames how modern scholars should understand him as a redactor. Moreover, the textual data highlights the central redacting role Thomas of Celano had on the Franciscan hagiographical tradition.

[152] The Portiuncula Chapter of LMj 4.10.1–2 appears only in L3C 57.1–4 and AP 36.11–37.1–4; see Solvi, *Officina Franciscana*, vol, 1, 211. The Rewriting of the Rule of LMj 11.7–8 only appears in L3C 62.5–7, AP 44.6–8 and AC 17; see Solvi, *Officina Franciscana*, vol. 1, 211.

recount the same two stories found in the *Legenda major*, the textual transmission of the Latin is not direct, so, given the preponderance of 1C, 2C, 3C and LJS throughout the rest of the *Legenda major*, it is probable that Bonaventure knew of these two stories from circulating oral traditions instead of earlier texts.

While a full presentation of the intertextuality of the sources and the *Legenda major* exceeds the scope of this essay, Bonaventure's redaction of the earlier hagiographical sources falls into three categories: (1) textually dependent episodes that appear in 1, 2, 3 Celano and/or Julian of Speyer and the *Legenda major*;[153] (2) new narrative episodes in the *Legenda major* not found in the earlier materials, and/or significant interpolations of explanatory material that add a significant theological gloss to earlier sources;[154] (3) deleted episodes that appear in 1, 2, 3 Celano and/or Julian of Speyer but not in the *Legenda major*.[155] The textual evidence presents

---

Only AC 17 mentions that the first Rule was lost, which Bonaventure transforms into a typological comparison with Moses who destroyed the first set of the Decalogue.

[153] Solvi, *Officina Franciscana*, vol. 1, 202–237 provides detailed intertextual tables. My own research tables corroborate Solvi's textual data but provide narrative focus to the intertextuality among the sources by examining various sources within the LMj narrative units instead of segmenting individual lines that ignore the narrative. Hence, Solvi identifies 415 discrete episodes divided according to source analysis. In contrast, my tables identify 292 distinct narative units that incorporate Solvi's analysis. For example, Solvi divides LMj 1.1 into six sub-sections based on the differing sources utilized (i.e., 1.1.1–2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4–5, 1.1.6, 1.1.7–8, 1.1.9–10). My analysis identifies four narrative units that utilize the same sources Solvi identifies (i.e., 1.1.1–2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4–6, 1.1.7–10). While both Solvi and I identify the same sources, he proliferates his divisions of the LMj because his primary focus is the identification of intertextuality among the early sources. In contrast, my primary focus is the intertextuality present within the LMj narrative.

[154] The plain text below indicates new material; the underlined text below indicates that most of the section contains interpretive interpolation. Note that the interpolations usually occure at the beginning of chapters, the end of chapters, or at transitions between sections that provide a significant theological gloss. The prologue has no earlier hagiographical source. Instead, it incorporates material from *Salvator saeculi* (1255), see note 92 and related text; *Chapter 1:* 1.6.8; *ch. 2:* 2.4.6–7, 2.6.1–2, 2.6.7–12, 2.7.3, 2.8.4, 2.8.9–12; *ch. 3:* 3.1.1, 2.4.1–5, 3.5.1–5, 3.9.1–7, 3.10.1–4, 3.10.9–11; *ch. 4:* 4.3.2–3, 4.4.1–5, 4.7.6–9, 4.8.1–6, 4.9.8–9, 4.10.1–2, 4.11.7–10; *ch. 5:* 5.1.1–3, 5.1.7–8, 5.2.1–4, 5.2.5–6, 5.6.1, 5.6.5–7, 5.8.1–5, 5.9.11, 5.9.11, 5.11.6, 5.12.1–6; *ch. 6*: 6.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.2.6–8, 6.5.7–8, 6.1.1, 6.7.8–9, 6.9.6–7, 6.10.1–2, 6.11.1–2, 6.11.8–9; *ch. 7:* 7.2.3–6, 7.6.4–6, 7.7.1, 7.8.3–5, 7.9.2–3, 7.11.1–6, 7.13.3–6; *ch. 8:* 8.1, 8.7.3–5, 8.4.1, 8.4.5, 8.5.8, 8.5.14–15, 8.6.1–3, 8.6.10–11, 8.7.1–3, 8.7.4–11, 8.9.1–6, 8.10.6–7, 8.10.13, 8.11.8, 8.11.9–10; *ch. 9:* 9.2.1–3, 9.3.5–8, 9.5.1–2, 9.6.5, 9.6.5, 9.7.1–6, 9.8.1–18, 9.9.1–5; *ch. 10:* 10.1.1–5, 10.2.8–9, 10.3.1, 10.4.3–4, 10.6.10–11, 10.6.12–13; *ch. 11:* 11.1.4–6, 11.2.3–4, 11.3.1, 11.3.12, 11.4.10–11, 11.5.9, 11.6.8–9, 11.7.1–4, 11.10.8, 11.13.6, 11.14.1–7; *ch. 12:* 12.1.1–14, 12.2.1–3, 12.2.4–8, 12.6.1–5, 12.7.1–4, 12.8.1–7, 12.10.4, 12.12.1–4; *ch. 13:* 13.2–4–5, 13.3.1, 13.3.7–9, 13.4.1–8, 13.5.1–4, 13.7.1–9, 13.8.1–5, 13.8.10–12, 13.9.1–6, 13.10.1–9; *ch. 14:* 14.2.5–9, 14.4.5–6, 14.4.8, 14.6.2, 14.6.10; *ch. 15:* 15.1.1–4, 15.2.1–4, 15.4.3–5, 15.6.2, 15.6.3, 15.7.1–4, 15.8.2–5.

[155] Paragraph numbers in 1C with no reference in the LMj: 7, 9, 20, 28, 41, 46, 74–75, 83, 87, 89–90, 96–99, 101–102, 104, 111, 122; paragraph numbers in 2C with no reference in

a hagiographical context. This context provides valuable information on how Bonaventure redacts earlier sources as he reinterprets Francis within an intricate theological framework constructed according to the triple way of purgation, illumination and perfection.

Textual Structure and Performance

The Textual Structure

The *Legenda major*'s intricate structure frames its theological interpretation. It has become standard in modern scholarship to structure the text according to the triple way of purgation, illumination, and perfection,[156] which organizes the *Legenda major* in three ways: the macro, intermediate, and micro levels.

First, the macro-structure appears in the prologue's very first line, which presents the triple way:

> *The grace of God our Savior has appeared in these last days* in his servant Francis *to all* who are truly humble and lovers of holy poverty, who, while venerating in him God's superabundant mercy, learn by his example [1] *to reject* wholeheartedly *ungodliness and worldly passions*, [2] to live in conformity with Christ and [3] to thirst after *blessed hope* with unflagging desire.[157]

---

the LMj: 1–2, 4, 7, 13–14, 21, 23–26, 29, 32–33, 35–37, 40, 42–43, 47–48, 51–54, 60, 62–63, 65–66, 69–70, 74, 76, 78–79, 86, 88–92, 104–105, 107, 110, 115, 121, 125–128, 130–132, 134, 139, 141–142, 144, 146, 149–150, 153, 159, 162–163, 169, 174–180, 183–193, 203–208, 210–213, 219, 220; paragraph numbers in 3C with no reference in the LMj (italics indicate 3C appearing in the LMj miracles: 1, *6–13*, *16*, 28, 34–39, *40*, *42–52*, 53, *54*, 55, *56–59*, 60, *61*, 62–80, *81–83*, 84, *85–86*, 87, *88–89*, 90, *91*, 92, *93–100*, 101–105, *106*, 107, *109*, 110–115, *116–120*, *122–123*, *125*, 126–127, *128–129*, 130–136, *137*, 138–145, *146–152*, 153–154, 157, *158–159*, 160–173, 175, 179–180, *181–184*, 185–186, *187*, 188, *189–192*, 193–194, 196–198; paragraph numbers in LJS with no reference in the LMj: 11, 43, 56, 66.

[156] First identified by Damien Vorreux in *François d'Assise: Documents, écrits et premières biographies* (Paris: 1968), 585; Regis Armstrong later developed the insight in his dissertation and subsequent studies: "The Spiritual Theology of the *Legenda major* of Saint Bonaventure (PhD dissertation, Fordham University: 1978); "Towards an Unfolding of the Structure of St. Bonaventure's *Legenda major*," *Laurentianum* 29 (1988): 330–46. The fact that most modern translations of the *Legenda major* introduce the text's structure as following the triple way demonstrates that the interpretation has become normative; see note 5.

[157] LMj prol. 1.1 (*Fontes*, 777; FA:ED 2, 525): *Apparuit gratia Dei Salvatoris nostri diebus istis novissimis* in servo suo Francisco *omnibus* vere humilibus et sanctae paupertatis amicis, qui superaffluentem in eo Dei misericordiam venerantes, ipsus erudiuntur exemplo, *impietatem et saecularia desideria* funditus *abnegare*, Christo conformiter vivere et ad *beatam spem* desiderio indefesso sitire (Tit. 2:11–13; Acts 2:17, Heb. 1:2).

The end of the prologue also alludes to the triple way when it organizes the text's macro-structure of fifteen chapters according to the beginning, progress, and end of Francis' life (Table 1).[158]

Table 1: The Maco-Structure of the *Legenda major*

Beginning	Progress	End
Chs. 1–4	Chs. 5–13	Chs. 14–15
Purgation	Illumination	Perfection

Accordingly, the *beginning* historical narrative of Francis' life (chs. 1–4) refers to purgation, the *progress* of his life according to the virtues (chs. 5–13), which follow a "more thematic order" instead of a strict "chronological order,"[159] refers to illumination, and the two historical chapters at the *end*, which narrate Francis' death and canonization (chs. 14–15), refer to perfection.

Second, the triple way also orders the text's intermediate-structure in two key ways: one historical, the other thematic.[160] On the one hand, the historical narrative (beginning and end) pair and subdivide according to the triple way (Table 2).

Table 2: The Intermediate Structure of the *Legenda major*'s "historical chapters"

Chs. 1–2	Chs. 3–4	Chs. 14–15
Purgation	Illumination	Perfection

On the other hand, the thematic narrative (process) subdivides the chapters on the virtues (chs. 5–13) in a manner similar to that of the *De triplici*

[158] LMj prol. 5.1 (*Fontes*, 780, FA:ED 2, 529). The prologue's basic threefold division and listing of the fifteen chapters precludes the *miracula* as integral to the analysis of the *Legenda major*. Hence, the parameters for analysis are the fifteen chapters listed in the prologue. In dividing the text in this threefold manner, Bonaventure basically follows 2C, which divides into two Books. Bk. 1 (chs. 1–17) is historical, covering Francis' early life, conversion, approval of the Rule, and communal life at the Portiuncula; Bk. 2 (chs. 18–167) presents an extensive description of Francis' virtues as a "mirror of sanctity and an image of perfection" (2C 26). Chs. 162–167 cover Francis' death. In effect, Bonaventure adopts the basic structure of 2C, but adapts it according to the triple way.

[159] LMj prol. 4.1 (*Fontes*, 780; FA:ED 2, 528): *ordinem temporis texui (. . .) ordinem servare studui magis aptae iuncturae.*

[160] Armstrong, "Towards an Unfolding," 336–337, suggests that the historical and thematic subdivisions parallel each other: purgation (chs. 1–2 parallel chs. 5–7), illumination (chs. 3–4 parallel chs. 8–10), and perfection (chs. 11–13 parallel chs. 14–15).

via (Table 3).[161] The 3x3 framework operates on two levels simultaneously. Horizontally, the central nine chapters form three groups of three chapters, which represent the triple way (Table 3, horizontal).

Table 3: The Intermediate 3×3 Structure of the *Legenda major*'s "thematic chapters"

	Purgation	*Illumination*	*Perfection*
Purgation	Ch. 5	Ch. 8	Ch. 11
	Austerity	Piety	Scripture/Prophecy
Illumination	Ch. 6	Ch. 9	Ch. 12
	Humility/Obedience	Charity	Preaching/Healing
Perfection	Ch. 7	Ch. 10	Ch. 13
	Poverty	Prayer	Stigmata

Vertically, another more refined level further subdivides the three chapters of each group according to the triple way (Table 3, vertical). In effect, one can speak of poverty as the perfection of purgation, piety as the purgation of illumination, and preaching as the illumination of perfection, etc.

Third, the *Legenda major*'s utilization of the triple way within the micro-structure of each chapter (1–14)[162] has not been recognized by the scholarly community (Table 4).[163] Yet, the triple way provides the interpretive key for understanding the narrative within of each chapter. Taken together, the macro, intermediate, and micro structures help explain how Bonaventure organizes, interprets and redacts his sources as he constructs his hagiography of Francis according to a theology of grace that manifests itself through the repetitive activities of purgation, illumination, and perfection.

[161] See *Trip. via* prol. 1 and 3.9. Traditionally the *De triplici via* dates to c. 1260.

[162] Ch. 15 exluded, see notes 37 and 39.

[163] None of the studies listed in note 5 identify the triple way within the *Legenda major*'s micro-structure; nor does Fernando Uribe's study, *Il Francesco di Bonaventura: Lettura della Leggenda Maggiore* (Assisi: 2003). Regis Armstrong, who advanced the interpretation of the *Legenda major* according to the triple way, explicitly states the reason for this oversight: "Throughout these chapters we shall direct our attention to the architectonic pattern of the Seraphic Doctor, rather than to the details of each chapter or paragraph." In other words, Armstrong's analysis intentionally focused on the text's macro and intermediate structures, or what he calls the text's "architectonic pattern."

Table 4: The *Legenda major*'s Micro-Structure of Each Chapter according to the Triple Way

Chapter	Purgation	Illumination	Perfection
1	1	2–4	5–6
2	1–4	5–6	7–8
3	1–2	3–6	7–10
4	1	2–5	6–11
5	1–4	5–7	8–12
6	1–2	3–5	6–11
7	1–2	3–5	6–13
8	1–2	3–6	7–10
9	2–3	4	5–8
10	2–3	4–6	7
11	1	2	3–13
12	1	2–6	7–11
13	1	2–4	5–8
14	1–2	3–5	6

The micro-structure highlights the thoroughness with which Bonaventure applies his interpretive method that he identifies at the outset of the *Legenda major*: "learn by his example *to reject* wholeheartedly *ungodliness and worldly passions*, to *live in conformity with Christ*, and to thirst after *blessed hope* with unflagging desire."

Several textual indicators signal the performative nature of the triple way, that is, the reader/hearer is to imitate Francis, the hierarchic man (*vir hierarchicus*), and journey to union with God by conforming oneself to Christ like Francis. As I have mentioned,[164] the first sentence of the prologue instructs the reader/hearer to "learn by [Francis'] example," who is "an example for the perfect followers of Christ."

The transition from the beginning section (chs. 1–4) to the progress section (chs. 5–13) presents the "exposition of the virtues" as leading the reader/hearer to the final confirmation of the Rule in the stigmata (ch. 13). In effect, the virtues are the means to that end, namely, to "a seraphic activity that purifies, illumines, and inflames."[165] The end explicitly manifests the means of imitation that link the brothers, Francis, and Christ. Likewise, ch. 15 concludes the text by reminding the reader/hearer that:

[164] See note 65 and related text.

[165] LMj 13.7.7 (*Fontes*, 895; FA:ED 2, 635): *qui operatione seraphica purgat, illuminat et inflammat*.

> Francis, the servant and friend of the Most High, the founder and leader of the Order of the Lesser Brothers, the practitioner of poverty, the model of penance, the herald of truth, the mirror of holiness, and the exemplar of all Gospel perfection, foreordained by grace from heaven, in an ordered progression from the lowest level arrived at the very heights.[166]

The mention of the ordered progression in the previous exposition signals that Francis' hierarchical ascent is complete; thus, ch. 15 does not follow the method of the triple way, because Francis has made the *transitus* and his journey is complete.[167] As the prologue mentions, he is now *vir hierarchicus*. For Francis, all that was left was the confirmation of that fact by his canonization. But for the audience, the *Legenda major* calls the reader/hearer to an imitation of the saint by performing the triple way so that Francis' presence becomes manifest within the community that is gathered.

Performing the Legenda major: *The Triple Way*

The scope of this paper excludes the possibility of examining the triple way in the micro-structure of each chapter. Hence, two examples must suffice: ch. 4, "The Progress of the Order Under His Hand and the Confirmation of the Rule," and ch. 13, "The Sacred Stigmata." These two examples were chosen because they: (1) allow for the analysis of the micro-structure in both a "historical" and a "thematic" chapter, (2) represent the central events of the historical and thematic narratives, which Bonaventure links, that is, the stigmata confirms the Rule, which, in turn, (3) demonstrate how Bonaventure at these critical transitions weaves together the macro, intermediate, and micro-structures into a single narrative.

---

[166] LMj 15.1.1 (*Fontes*, 905; FA:ED 2, 645): *Franciscus igitur, servus et amicus Altissimi, Ordinis Minorum Fratrum institutor et dux, paupertatis professor, poenitentiae forma, veritatis praecox, sanctitatis speculum et totius evangelicae perfectionis exemplar, superna praeventus gratia, ordinato progressu ab infimis pervenit ad summa.* Note that Bonaventure highlights seven aspects of the ordered progression: (1) the servant and friend of the Most High, (2) the founder and leader of the order of the Lesser Brothers, (3) the practitioner of poverty, (4) the model of penance, (5) the herald of truth, (6) the mirror of holiness, and (7) the exemplar of all Gospel perfection. It seems that the progression follows Bonaventure's general understanding of Order, *II Sent* d. 11, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (2, 227): "For this is order, which executes and maintains the divine law in its operation, as it leads from the lowest through the center to the highest" [*Nam hic est ordo, quem divina lex in suis operibus exsequitur et conservat, ut postrema per media deducat ad summa*]. See J.A. Wayne Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology* (St. Bonaventure: 2001), 9–10 and 190.

[167] Again, ch. 15 contains nine lessons and likely served as the text for the feast of Francis' translation; see notes 37 and 39.

The Micro-Structure within ch. 4

The last line of ch. 3 helps introduce the materials in ch. 4:

> [Pope Innocent III] approved the rule, gave them a mandate to preach penance, and had small tonsures given to all the lay brothers, who were accompanying the servant of God, so they could freely preach *the word of God*.[168]

Ch. 3 ends by making it clear that Francis' preaching activity and that of his companions had the pope's sanction.[169] It finds its rejoinder in the first line of ch. 4, "Relying on divine grace and papal authority, Francis, with great confidence, took to the Spoleto valley, that *he might fulfill and teach* Christ's Gospel."[170] The second line introduces three questions the early companions discussed on the way: how to keep the rule, how to advance in holiness and justice, and how to improve themselves and be an example for others.[171] These three questions conceal the chapter's triple way micro-structure of purgation, illumination, and perfection.[172]

First, the opening episode relates to purgation and how the companions might keep the Rule. It tells of the exhausted and hungry brothers receiving bread from a man who suddenly appears and then disappears.[173] Bonaventure's interpolation clarifies that "the gift of divine generosity" provided greater sustenance than their miraculously provided food. Thus, God's providence, not human effort, enables the brothers to keep the Rule they had promised to Christ before his vicar, Innocent III. Strengthened by "divine consolation," the brothers make the firm and irrevocable resolution to never withdraw from their promise of poverty in spite of starvation or tribulation.[174] The clear implication is that all Francis' companions,

---

[168] LMj 3.10 (*Fontes*, 802–803; FA:ED 2, 548–549): *Approbavit regulam, dedit de poenitentia praedicanda mandatum et laicis fratribus omnibus, qui servum Dei fuerant comitati, fecit coronas parvulas fieri, ut verbum Dei libere praedicarent.*

[169] See note 83 and related text.

[170] LMj 4.1.1 (*Fontes*, 803; FA:ED 2, 550): *Fretus exinde Franciscus superna gratia et auctoritate papali, cum fiducia multa versus vallem Spoletanam iter arripuit, ut Evangelium Christi* faceret et doceret (Acts 1:1).

[171] 1C 34 records four questions. The LMj does not include the first, "How could they carry out his advice and commands?" LJS 22 conflates the four questions of 1C 34 into two.

[172] See Table 4 for a synoptic division of the chapter according to the triple way.

[173] In making the event miraculous, Bonaventure follows LJS 22 instead of 1C 34, which states the man simply left.

[174] LMn 4.1.7 redacts 2C 35 in two ways: (1) Bonaventure adds the two adverbs *firmiter* (firmly) and *irrevocabiliter* (irrevocably), which emphasize the companions' decision to keep the Rule, and (2) he changes *agitati tribulationibus* (agitated by tribulations) and *impulsi tentationibus* (driven by temptation) to *nullius inediae aut tribulationis impulsu* (driven by neither starvation nor tribulation). The LMj replaces temptation with starvation.

past and present, should do the same and overcome difficulties by trusting God's grace and providence.

Second, the next three episodes convey certain elements in their illumination regarding how they could advance in holiness and justice before God. To this end, the companions first decided whether, in living their "holy proposal," they should remain in solitude or live among the people, ministering to them.[175] "Illumined by a revelation,"[176] Francis chooses to live for all like Christ who died for all. Again, the companions should do the same. Thus, to advance toward God, the brothers must live among others "according to the form of holy poverty," which involves "much work and lack of things."[177]

Yet the life of the companions is not just active, "for they spent their time there praying incessantly."[178] Since the companions did not yet have liturgical books for chanting the hours,[179] Francis taught them, by word and example, from the "book" of Christ's cross.[180] In effect, Christ is the lesson, Francis the teacher, and the brothers, the students. Francis also taught his companions specific prayers,[181] and to praise God in and through creation, to honor priests, and to follow the faith of the Roman church. An interpolation adds that the companions "observed the holy father's teaching in all things."[182]

Bonaventure emphasizes Francis' fidelity to the Roman Church with an interpolation that introduces the next episode. Francis, leaving his

---

[175] Francis alone faces the same dilemma at the start of Chapter 12, namely, should Francis remain alone in prayer or go out and preach to others? See LMj 12.1–2.

[176] LMj 4.2.2 (*Fontes*, 804; FA:ED 2, 551): *revelationis illustrates.* Most accounts of Francis' dreams, visions and revelations from heaven occur within sections that have been identified as "illumination." Dreams and visions of others besides Francis most often occur in sections identified as perfection.

[177] LMj 4.3.1 (*Fontes*, 804; FA:ED 2, 551): *secundum sanctae paupertatis formam in labore multo et inopia.*

[178] LMj 4.3.2 (*Fontes*, 804; FA:ED 2, 551): *Vacabant enim ibidem divinis precibus incessanter.*

[179] The text includes a notable redaction. Whereas Bonaventure assumes that the early friars did not say the office because they "did not yet have liturgical books," 2C 45 reports that the brothers "did not yet know the ecclesiastical office." Bonaventure makes the lack of reciting the office a poverty issue, a lack that the order eventually developed beyond. The development distinguishes the brothers of the past from the present brothers.

[180] Earlier in LMj 1.5.9, Francis initial conversion is marked by the Gospel passage: *If you wish to come after me, deny yourself and take up your cross and follow me*. The citation of Mt. 16:24 is an interpolation by Bonaventure. It does not occur in any of the earlier sources.

[181] Specifically the *Our Father* and Francis' prayer of Test. 5, "We adore you, O Christ (. . .)." Both these prayers are mentioned in 1C 45 and LJS 27.

[182] LMj 4.3.6 (*Fontes*, 805; FA:ED 2, 551): *Servabant illi patris sancti documenta per Omnia.*

companions, "entered Assisi to preach in the cathedral on Sunday morning, as was his custom."[183] Innocent III had already granted Francis and his companions the authority to preach freely, and now Bonaventure highlights the acceptance of Francis' preaching by the local bishop, who allowed him, as a custom, to preach in the cathedral. The text strategically reports that Francis had universal papal permission and local diocesan authorization.

What follows is the main point of the illumination section: the episode of the fiery chariot.[184] Having left for his preaching engagement the night before, Francis is separated from his companions who remained outside Assisi. Nevertheless, at about midnight, the companions saw a fiery chariot that opened the conscience of all the brothers to each other. The "transfigured image" of Francis brought the brothers to a collective agreement to follow Francis, who, "*while away from them in body, was present in spirit*."[185] The Elijah/Elisha—Francis/companions imagery provides particularly pertinent instruction for brothers who had promised to follow Francis decades after his death. Like Elijah, God made Francis a chariot and charioteer for spiritual men (*virorum spiritualium*),[186] and, like Elisha, upon whom Elijah's spirit rested, God opened the eyes of the companions to see God's wondrous protection (2 Kgs. 6:15–17).[187] In other words, Francis is the means and end for those companions called to be "spiritual men," but such men must have their eyes opened by God. Hence, Bonaventure makes a crucial distinction between Francis and the *viri spirituales* who must follow him. With an interpolation about the growth of the order (the *viri spirituales*?), Bonaventure ends the episode with the main point:

---

[183] LMj 4.4.1 (*Fontes*, 805; FA:ED 2, 551) *intravit Assissii, praedicaturus mane diei dominicae, ut moris erat, in ecclesia cathedrali*. With LMj 3.10.11, Bonaventure has Innocent III granting Francis and his companions the authority to preach freely; now, Bonaventure emphasizes the ecclesiastical acceptance of the preaching of Francis, who, as a custom, preached in the cathedral, that is, the bishop's own church. In effect, Francis had universal papal permission, and local diocesan authorization.

[184] Mentioned in the prologue, see LMj prol. 1.6.

[185] The earlier sources do not cite 1 Cor. 5:3.

[186] The use of the title *viri spirituales* and the Elijah typology highlight the eschatological dimensions of this episode. On the eschatological/apocalyptic dimensions of the title *vir spirituales*, see Stanislao da Campagnola, "Dai '*viri spirituali*' di Gioacchino da Fiore ai '*fratres spirituales*' di Francesco d'Assisi," in *Francesco e francescanesimo nella società dei secoli XIII–XIV*, ed. Stanislao da Campagnola (Assisi: 1999). Moreover, in Mal. 3:23 Elijah's return is prophesied before the "day of the Lord," making him, according to Christian eschatology, the harbinger of Christ's return.

[187] The passive periphrastic of the Latin emphasizes the parallel between Elisha and the companions.

"the brothers truly realized *the Spirit of the Lord had come to rest* upon [Francis] in such a fullness that it was absolutely safe for them to follow after his life and teaching."[188] What was true of Francis' companions is also true of Bonaventure's brothers whom he instructs. To become "spiritual men," the brothers must follow Francis according to their collective good conscience informed by Francis, whereby they will advance in holiness and justice before God.

Third, the section of perfection and the need for the brothers to improve themselves so as to be examples for others occupies the last seven episodes. The scene shifts back to the Portiuncula. For Bonaventure, the Portiuncula is the link between Francis and the order that developed. It is where Francis began humbly, progressed virtuously, and ended happily.[189] It is also where Francis "conceived and brought to birth the spirit of Gospel truth"[190] by forming a *religio* comprised of his spiritual sons.[191] Thus, headquartered at the Portiuncula, Francis set out as a "herald of the Gospel" to proclaim "God's Kingdom." His preaching, inspired by the "power of the Spirit," produced abundant fruit in Christ's vineyard.[192]

Drawn by Francis' preaching, many others join the twelve companions. It is during this time of expansion that Francis decided to call their manner of living (*vivendi modum*) the Order of the Brothers of Penance. All were admitted regardless of status: clerics and lay, virgins and married. Bonaventure presents Clare as a preeminent example.[193] The increasing numbers followed in Francis' footsteps because they desired "the perfection of Christ."[194] Bonaventure goes on to describe poverty as the key characteristic of such perfection. He reports that others recognized the brothers' holiness, a holiness, described by an interpolation, that was pleased with little instead of much.[195] Bonaventure presents three examples

---

[188] LMj 4.4.7 (*Fontes*, 806; FA:ED 2, 552): *vere cognoverunt fratres, super servum suum Franciscum* Spiritum Domini *in tanta plenitudine* quievisse, *quod post ipsius doctrinam et vitam erat eis proficisci tutissimum.*

[189] LMj 2.8.4.

[190] LMj 3.1.1 (*Fontes*, 794; FA:ED 2, 542): *concepit ipse ac peperit spiritum evangelicae veritatis.*

[191] The imagery of motherhood and children is found throughout ch. 3, see: LMj 3.3.4, 3.7.1–2, 3.10.2; also see 8.1.3, 9.6.5. See note 63.

[192] LMj 4.5. Quotation from 4.5.2 (*Fontes*, 807; FA:ED 2, 553): *virtute Spiritus.*

[193] LMj 4.6.3–4. Bonaventure makes no distinction between the three orders as he did earlier in LMj 2.8.12. Under the single title of "Brothers of Penance," he includes both men and women.

[194] LMj 4.7.1 (*Fontes*, 807; FA:ED 2, 554): *perfectionis Christi.*

[195] LMj 4.7.5.

of such poverty, of which the first two only appear in the *Legenda major*. The pious Saracen who, respecting the companions' poverty, ministered to their needs,[196] provides Bonaventure with the opportunity to insert a harsh critique of those inside and outside the order who maligned mendicancy: "Hence, what a horrible and nefarious crime that a Christian man should trample upon this noble pearl that a Saracen exalted with such veneration!"[197] The Crosier Morico who, having been healed by Francis, joined the order and became a model of simple living according to his clothing, food and drink.[198] And Brother Pacifico who, seeing two swords forming a cross over Francis' body,[199] resolved to leave the restless worldliness of his former life and join Francis so as to embrace Christ's peace.

With these three episodes, Bonaventure subtly advances the notions of "poor use" via the Saracen's generous benefaction, the need to embrace a mendicant lifestyle via Morico's profession, and the rejection of the world's vanities via Pacifico's conversion. The episodes end with Bonaventure's instructive interpolation to his brothers regarding Francis' desire "*to mark with a Tau the foreheads of those moaning and grieving*, of those truly converted to Jesus Christ."[200] In effect, Bonaventure calls his brothers to be marked with the Tau as was Francis, a mark that comes through poverty.

For a second time, the scene then shifts back to the Portiuncula, to the Pentecost Chapter of 1217. Here the end of the chapter parallels its beginning. Just as the twelve companions had no provisions,[201] the five thousand

---

196 LMj 4.7.6–9.

197 LMj 4.7.9 (*Fontes*, 808; FA:ED 2, 555): *Horrendum proinde ac nefarium scelus, ut hanc* margaritam *nobilem vir christianus* conculcet, *quam tanta veneratione extulit Saracenus.*

198 The Crosiers' origins lie in the events of the third crusade (1189–1192). Innocent III verbally approved the order in 1210, and Innocent IV granted them final approval in 1248. It seems that the Crosiers were a threat to the Franciscan order at Bonaventure's time. Arriving in Paris sometime between 1248 and 1256, they adopted the administrative structure of the Franciscan and Dominican orders, but rejected mendicancy and its prohibition of common property. Hence, they looked mendicant according to their organization, but their way of life did not embrace mendicancy. The fact that the Crosiers survived the 1274 decree *Religionum diversitatem* supports the claim that they were not a mendicant order. That decree ordered the abolition of mendicant orders founded with papal approval after 1215 (Lateran IV); see J. Michael Hayden, "The Crosiers in England and France," *Clairlieu* 22 (1964): 91–109, esp. 92, 95–96, and 102–04.

199 Pacifico's vision of the cross represents the fourth vision of the cross that Bonaventure recounts in LMj 13.10.3.

200 LMj 4.9.9 (*Fontes*, 810; FA:ED 2, 556): *signare Thau (…) super frontes virorum gementium et dolentium, ad Christum Iesum veraciter conversorum.*

201 LMj 4.1.

brothers at chapter received all they needed through divine mercy.[202] Likewise, just as the companions experience Francis' presence during his absence in their vision of the fiery chariot,[203] the brothers at the Chapter of Arles experience Francis "present in spirit" through the preaching of Brother Anthony.[204] The Latin construction is even the same, *credendum sane* (certainly it must be believed). Just as God opened the eyes of the early companions to see the chariots circling Elisha, God also allowed Francis to be present with the later brothers at chapter while Anthony was preaching.[205] Twice Bonaventure instructs his brothers to believe that the presence of Francis' spirit is also available to them.

The last episode tells of the confirmation of the Rule. Again, Bonaventure's segue is the growth of the order.[206] An interpolation reports that after the order was already widespread, a revelation from God "warned" Francis to have the "form of living" (*vivendi formam*) that was approved by Innocent III "made perpetually effective" by Honorius III. Accordingly, a voice from above says to Francis, "Francis, make one host out of all the crumbs, and give it to those who want to eat."[207] Those who did not receive it devoutly were covered with leprosy. The revelation is indeed a warning, for the next day a voice from heaven explained the vision to Francis, "Francis, the crumbs of last night are the words of the Gospel; the host is the rule, and the leprosy is wickedness."[208]

---

[202] LMj 4.10. This is one of two episodes in the *Legenda major* that involves a story that appears in L3C or AP and not Celano or Julian of Speyer. The story of the feeding of the five thousand brothers at the Pentecost Chapter occurs in L3C 57 and AP 36–37.

[203] LMj 4.4.

[204] LMj 4.10.3–7. Brother Monaldo's vision of Francis lifted up in the air with his arms extended as if on a cross represents the fifth vision of the cross recounted by Bonaventure at LMj 13.10.3.

[205] Three points: (1) Bonaventure validates Monaldo's vision with Francis' own testimony (LMj 4.10.5), which the early sources do not report. (2) The mention of the story of Ambrose and St Martin is the only reference in the entire *Legenda major* where Bonaventure mentions one of the great saints common in monastic hagiography, i.e., Antony of Egypt, Martin of Tours, and Benedict of Nursia, all of whom appear in Thomas' *legendae*. Note that in Bonaventure's interpolation about Ambrose and Martin, Francis is compared to Ambrose and Anthony to Martin. (3) Whereas the first story has the companions realizing that "the Spirit of the Lord had come to rest upon [Francis]," the second story has "the Spirit bearing witness to the true presence of the holy father among them." In effect, the later brothers can only become *viri spirituales* by the power of the Spirit.

[206] Compare LMj 4.4.6, 4.6.1, 4.7.1 to 4.11.1.

[207] LMj 4.11.3 (*Fontes*, 812; FA:ED 2, 558): *Francisce, unam de micis omnibus hostiam facito et manducare volentibus tribue.*

[208] LMj 4.11.6 (*Fontes*, 812; FA:ED 2, 558): *Francisce, micae praeteritae noctis verba evangelica sunt, hostia regula, lepra iniquiras.*

Three points about the vision: (1) Bonaventure's description of the vision is taken almost verbatim from 2C 209,[209] but his explanation of the vision is an interpolation that alters the meaning of the vision in two critical ways.[210] On the one hand, Bonaventure claims that Francis went "to condense [the Rule] *just as the instructive vision had dictated*."[211] Yet, the vision instructs Francis to "make one host out of *all* the crumbs,"[212] not "to condense it." With the addition of *redigere*, Bonaventure makes the shortening of the Rule a divine prerogative. Hence, the shorter Rule of 1224 is absolutely authoritative, and so, as the vision warns, those brothers who do not follow it are wicked (leprosy). On the other hand, 2C 209 contains no typological parallels with Moses, namely, Moses' reception of the Ten Commandments and Francis' reception of the Rule.[213] Both men fasted before receiving God's law, both ascended a mountain, both were accompanied by an vicar who failed in some way, and both had to receive God's "rules" a second time, since mishaps resulted in the loss of the original texts."[214] The typological interpolation dominates the explanation of Francis' vision, with Honorius III's confirmation of the Rule being mentioned almost in passing.[215]

(2) In the vision, Francis had to gather "tiny bread crumbs" and distribute them "to a crowd of hungry brothers." This is the third mention of "hungry brothers" in c. 4. The first occurred as the companions talked

---

[209] While 2C 209 reports that the vision was shown to Francis in a dream, LMj 4.11.1 makes no mention of a dream, rather, it is *Deo revelatione*.

[210] LMj 4.11.7–8.

[211] LMj 4.11.7 (*Fontes*, 812; Fa:ED 2, 558): *iuxta quod dictabat visio monstrata, redigere.*

[212] LMj 4.11.3 (*Fontes*, 812; FA:ED 2, 558): *unam de micis* omnibus *hostiam facito* (emphasis added). 2C 209 makes it clear that the episode concerns the confirmation of the Rule of 1224: "It was at the time when there was discussion among the brothers about confirming the Rule, and the saint was extremely anxious about this matter" [*Tempore quo de Regula confirmanda fiebat inter fratres collatio, sancto de huiusmodi negotio vehementer sollicito*].

[213] All are allusions to Deuteronomy: fasting and mountain ascent (9:9), vicar fails (9:20), second reception (10:1).

[214] AC 17 is the only other pericope that contains the story of the first rule being lost. However, it contains no Moses typology. The mention of the "lost Rule" in the *Legenda major* is the second occurrence where an apparent reference to the earlier sources cannot be cross-referenced with its occurrence in either Thomas of Celano or Julian of Speyer, the other being the feeding of the five thousand at the Pentecost Chapter, see note 201 and related text. Given the computer analysis that suggests that Bonaventure did not use the AC as a source, I doubt that Bonaventure is actually citing the *Assisi Compilation*; rather, this is an example where Bonaventure utilizes an oral tradition known to him beyond his textual sources, to augment his typology with Moses.

[215] Note that Innocent III's dream leads to his approval of the earlier Rule (LMj 3.9.6), but it is Francis' own "revelation from God" that leads to the confirmation of the later Rule by Honorius III (LMj 4.11.8).

during their journey to the Spoleto valley. The second is when the brothers gathered for the Pentecost Chapter. In the first two instances, God provided for the brothers, but in this last episode God instructs Francis to feed his brothers on the spiritual sustenance of the Rule. The imagery of hunger would be particularly relevant to the practice of refectory reading "at table" when the brothers gathered to eat.[216]

(3) Ch. 4 contains four visions: the brothers' three visions about Francis (Chariot, Pacifico, Monaldo), and Francis' final vision concerning the Rule. Two of the visions instruct the brothers that Francis can be spiritually present even when absent (Chariot, Monaldo), and the other instructs them to "do better" so that they, like Francis, can be marked by the Tau (Pacifico). All the visions proclaim that Francis' teachings should be followed. Francis' last vision is about his attempt to gather his teaching about the Gospel into a Rule, which will sustain devout brothers and punish wicked ones. Significantly, the text only identifies Francis' vision as revelation.[217] Hence, it is the Rule that teaches the brothers "how to improve themselves" and it is in living the Rule that Francis, although physically gone, with remain spiritually present among them.

The last two lines of ch. 4 are also interpolations, which move the text in two complementary directions. In one way, Bonaventure concludes the chapter by having Francis fervently encouraging the brothers to observe the Rule that "had been divinely revealed."[218] In another way, Bonaventure looks forward to ch. 13 and to God's own confirmation of the Rule in Francis' stigmata, which the finger of the living God imprinted upon him.[219] The entire chapter has been about following the Rule. It opens with the companions' questioning how they might "sincerely keep the rule," it proceeds by presenting Francis' life and teaching as "absolutely safe," and it ends with Francis' exhortation to follow the Rule, and the dual confirmation of the Rule by Honorius and God. Yet by linking chs. 4 and 13 via the

---

[216] The rubric to Vat. Lat. 7570 states that the *Legenda major* can be read "at table" (*ad mensam*) during the entire octave of Francis' death. See *Analecta Franciscana* X, lxxiv.

[217] Twice, the Chapter explicitly identifies Francis' experiences of God as revelation, i.e., LMj 4.2.3 and 4.11.1.

[218] LMj 4.11.9: The full sentence reads, *Ad cuius observantiam fratres ferventer inducens, dicebat, se nihil ibi posuisse secundum industriam propriam, sed omnia sic scribi fecisse, sicut sibi fuerant divinitus revelata.*

[219] LMj 4.11.10: The imagery of the *finger of the living God* concludes the chapter with another allusion to Moses (Dt. 9:10), which, at the same time, looks forward to the New Law of Christ (2 Cor. 3:3 and Rev. 7:2). Also note that Bonaventure had already interpreted the stigmata as God's confirmation of the Rule in a 1255 morning sermon delivered at Paris on Francis' feast day (9, 590).

dual confirmation,[220] Bonaventure is also instructing his brothers on how they can live the Rule by progressing in the virtues with Francis as the guide. In effect, Bonaventure's textual "signposting" does more than just provide a transition between the sections of the text's macro structure; it also instructs readers on how they can confirm the Rule with their virtuous lives. Accordingly, the analysis now turns to the thirteenth chapter and to the culmination of the virtues in Francis' stigmata.

The Micro-Structure within Chapter 13

Structurally, ch. 13 does double duty. It culminates the nine thematic chapters (see Table 3) and resumes the six historical chapters (see Table 2).[221] The strategic locus of the chapter within the text's structure highlights the theological significance of the stigmata as the sacrament of Christ's crucifixion on the cross.[222] Accordingly, Bonaventure interprets Francis' entire life and teaching through the lens of the stigmata.[223] Moreover, the stigmata is the only time Bonaventure explicitly mentions the triple way: "Thus, it is obvious to certain witnesses that those sacred marks

---

[220] Bonaventure actually posits an historical inaccuracy to heighten the connection between the two confirmations. He states that the stigmata occurred after "only a few days had passed" since the confirmation of the Rule [*paucis admodum evolutis diebus*]. In reality, at least one year separates the two events, i.e., fall 1223 to fall 1224.

[221] The dual thematic/historical role of ch. 13 helps explain differing interpretations of the *Legenda major*'s structure. Armstong, "Towards an Unfolding," 335, considers it as the last chapter within the nine central chapters on the virtues (chs. 5–13), while Bihl identifies it as one of the historical chapters, the one that resumes after the eight intervening chapters on the virtues, *Analecta Franciscana* 10, lxv–lxvi.

[222] Bonaventure calls the stigmata a sacrament four times in LMj (13.4.1, 13.4.4, 13.5.3, 15.2.2), once in the LMn (6.4.1). In calling the stigmata a sacrament, Bonaventure follows 1C 114 and 2C 203. Bonaventure also describes the stigmata in several other ways: "the sign of the Lord's covenant" (prol. 1), "the seal of the likeness of the living God" (prol. 2), "the seal of Christ, the supreme pontiff" (4.11, 13.9), "a unique privilege (. . .) of bearing a likeness of the Lamb that was slain" (9.9), "the Lord's sacrament" (13.4), "the likeness of the crucified (. . .) the sacrament of the King" (13.5), "the stigmata of the Lord Jesus" (13.9), "the treasure found in the field" (13.8), "the sublime similitude of the Seraph and the humble likeness of the Crucified" (13.10), "the proof of Christian wisdom" (13.10), "an expressed likeness" (14.4), "certain signs of future glory (. . .) a singular privilege (. . .) a glimpse of the resurrection" (15.1), "heavenly pearls" (15.5), and a "sacred treasure" of "the seal of the Most High King" (15.8). Related to the stigmata is Bonaventure's emphasis on Christ's cross (*crux*), which he mentions sixty-three times, especially with the seven visions of the cross that culminate in the stigmata (13.9). Bonaventure ends the *Miracula* by again describing the significance of Christ's cross throughout Francis' life (10.8–9). Bonaventure also mentions the crucifixion (*crucifer/crucifigo/crucifixus*) twenty-six times.

[223] In effect, Bonaventure interprets Francis through the lens of the stigmata/cross, i.e., everything leads to the stigmata or flows from it; see Noel Muscat, *The Life of Saint Francis in the Light of Saint Bonaventure's Theology on the* "Verbum Crucifixum" (Rome: 1989).

were imprinted by the power of Him Who, through a seraphic activity, purifies, illumines, and inflames."[224] Francis is the "hierachic man" whom God "placed as an example for the perfect followers of Christ" precisely because he bore "the seal of the likeness of the living God, namely, Christ Crucified."[225]

Awareness of the triple way within the micro-structure of ch. 13 helps one to understand Bonaventure's presentation of the stigmata.[226] First, the chapter opens with purgation, described as Francis' practice of leaving the bustle of the crowds for the quiet of solitude where "he would shake off the dust that might have clung to him from the time spent with the crowds."[227] La Verna was such a place. There, by way of interpolation, Bonaventure conveys that Francis began his "usual custom" of a forty day fast.[228] The purgation episode is short and to the point: Francis, "the angelic man," leaves the world for the heights of "heavenly insights" that engulfed him in the most ardent desire to conform himself in every way to "God's good pleasure."[229]

Second, illumination comes in the form of a revelation via the story of Francis opening the Gospels three times.[230] Specifically, Francis, "through a divine prophecy," was told that in opening the Gospel Christ would

---

[224] LMj 13.7.7 (*Fontes*, 848; FA:ED 2, 635): *Certis itaque constat indiciis, sacra illa signacula illius impressa fuisse virtute, qui operatione seraphica purgat, illuminat et inflammat.*

[225] LMj prol. 1.6 (*Fontes*, 778; FA:ED 2, 526): *vir hierarchicus*; prol. 2.1 (*Fontes*, 778; FA:ED 2, 527): *qua et positus est perfectis Christi sectatoribus in exemplum*; prol. 2.3 (*Fontes*, 779; FA:ED 2, 527): *signaculum similitudinis Dei viventis, Christi videlicet crucifixi.*

[226] See Table 4 for a synoptic division of the chapter according to the triple way.

[227] LMj 13.1.3 (*Fontes*, 890; FA:ED 2, 630): *extergeret, si quid pulveris sibi ex conversatione hominum adhaesisset.* Note the relationship between chs. 12–14, which interlink the active and contemplative: the active life of preaching (12) relates to the contemplative life of mystical excess (13), which then returns to the active life of ministering to lepers (14). Bonaventure presents Francis as a model of both.

[228] LMj 13.1.5 (*Fontes*, 890; FA:ED 2, 631): *solitum morem quadragesimam*. Only Bonaventure supplies the historical detail of Francis' forty day fast in honor of St Michael the Archangel and the resulting effects of Francis' ardent desire. Compare 1C 94, LJS 61, LCh 11, L3C 69, and 3C 4. It seems that Bonaventure added the account of Francis' fast because he needed a purgation episode in ch. 13. The same can be said of the interpolation episode where Sylvester and Clare council Francis to preach at the outset of ch. 12, where again Bonaventure needs a purgation episode to commence the chapter.

[229] LMj 13.1.1 (*Fontes*, 889; FA:ED 2, 630): *angelico viro Francisco*; 13.1.5 (*Fontes*, 890; FA:ED 2, 631): *supernarum coepit immissionum*; 13.1.6 (*Fontes*, 890; FA:ED 2, 631): *beneplacitum Dei.*

[230] Also see LMj 3.3 where Francis opens the Gospels three times before founding the order by accepting Bernard.

reveal to him what would be most acceptable to God.[231] All three times the book opened to a passage about Christ's passion. Thus, Francis understood that, just as he had imitated Christ in life, he would also conform to Christ's passion before his death. To underscore the imitation/conformity progression, Bonaventure, by way of interpolation, provides a concise synopsis of the process of the thematic chapters. His great austerity (ch. 5) led to a greater desire for martyrdom out of his unconquerable love and unquenchable charity for Jesus (ch. 9), which transformed Francis into the crucified (ch. 13). The progress traces Francis' cultivation of desire: from inspiration, into a powerful charity, culminating in a seraphic ardor.

The vision of the seraph and the reception of the stigmata are the focal point of the illumination section. Atop the mountain, Francis saw a seraph with six wings in "the likeness of a man crucified."[232] Bonaventure explains the vision with an interpolation. Through God's revelation, Francis understood that divine providence showed him the seraphic vision to prepare him "to be totally transformed into the likeness of Christ crucified, not by the martyrdom of his flesh, but by the incineration of his mind."[233] Conformation requires transformation. As the vision disappeared, the stigmata appeared.

Bonaventure's description of the stigmata is lifted, almost completely, from 3C 4.[234] In contrast, his description of Francis' reaction to the stigmata is an interpolation. Francis feared making "the Lord's sacrament" public and so doubted whether he should tell others about the vision.[235] He shared this doubt with some brothers. In response, Brother Illuminato

---

[231] LMj 13.1.1 (*Fontes*, 889; FA:ED 2, 630): *Immissum est igitur menti eius per divinum oraculum, quod in apertione libri evangelici revelaretur ei a Christo, quid Deo in ipso et de ipso maxime foret acceptum*. Note that Francis' purgative activity led to "heavenly insights" (LMj 13.1.5: *supernarum coepit immissionum*), and his illumination was "through a divine prophecy that had been inserted into his mind" (LMj 13.2.1: *Immissum est igitur menti eius per divinum oraculum*). The repetition of *immissionum/Immissum est* links the two episodes together. Both appear within interpolations.

[232] LMj 13.3.3 (*Fontes*, 891; FA:ED 2, 632): *effigies hominis crucifixi*.

[233] LMj 13.3.8 (*Fontes*, 892; FA:ED 2, 632): *se non per martyrium carnis, sed per incendium mentis totum in Christi crucifixi similitudinem transformandum*.

[234] Bonaventure's three hagiographical texts actually provide four descriptions of the stigmata LMj 13.3.10–13, LMj 15.2, LMj *Miracula* 1.1–9, and LMn 6.3.1–4, which is unique because line 3 conveys details not found elsewhere.

[235] LMj 13.4, quotation at 13.4.1 (*Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 633): *Domini sacramentum*. Bonaventure follows 1C 90.8 in calling the stigmata a sacrament, but he employs the term more frequently (see note 222). By calling the stigmata a sacrament, Bonaventure compares them with the eucharist. In effect, just as Christ is truly present in the eucharist, so too is Christ truly present in Francis' stigmata. Bonaventure says as much when he claims, "therefore the love of Christ transformed the lover into his image" (*igitur versus*

convinced Francis to share the "divine sacraments" with others.[236] Two related aspects of the interpolation are significant. Only Bonaventure names Illuminato.[237] Thus, those who recognize the stigmata as sacraments, are, like Illuminato, "enlightened by grace."[238] And the episode concludes with *credendum sane* (certainly it must be believed) to explain why Francis' own explanation of the event is non-existent. With these two aspects (the stigmata are sacraments that Francis would not talk about) the illumination section ends.

Third, the section on perfection links material together on two levels. One level links ch. 13 back to ch. 4. Thus, "after the true love of Christ *transformed* the lover into His *image*,"[239] Francis "*came down from the mountain*" with "the likeness of the crucified" carved "not on *tablets of stone*" but "*engraved in his flesh by the finger of the living God*."[240] With literary skill, Bonaventure, via an interpolation, resumes the Moses imagery after the intervening eight chapters.[241] More proximately, the interpolation also returns to stress that Francis hid the sacred signs from others. Nevertheless, "the Lord Himself, who had imprinted those marks, openly revealed some miracles through them so that the hidden and marvelous power of the stigmata would display a brilliance of signs."[242] In other words, the stigmata are known by their effects, with God as their divine

---

Christi amor in eamdem imaginem transformavit amantem [LMj 13.5.1; *Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 634]).

[236] LMj 13.4.4 (*Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 633): *sacramenta divina*.

[237] Bonaventure also identifies Illuminato as the brother who accompanied Francis to Egypt during his meeting with the sultan (LMj 9.8), but again the earlier sources do not name Illuminato (1C 57, LJS 36). In effect, Bonaventure has Illuminato accompanying Francis during his failed attempt at martyrdom and as the first named witness to his mystical martyrdom. 3C 123 mentions Brother Illuminato as an unnamed son of a nobleman whom Francis cured of blindness. He was named for the event and then entered the order when he was old enough.

[238] LMj 13.4.3 (*Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 633): *gratia Illuminatus*.

[239] LMj 13.5.1 (*Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 634): *Postquam igitur verus Christi amor* in eamdem imaginem transformavit. Bonaventure employs the same imagery in his 1255 morning sermon for the feast of St Francis (9, 590).

[240] LMj 13.5.1 (*Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 634): descendit *angelicus vir Franciscus* de monte (Ex. 19:1), *secum ferens Crucifixi effigiem, non in* tabulis lapideis *vel ligneis manu figuratam artificis, sed in carneis membris descriptam* digito Dei *vivi*.

[241] See LMj 4.11 and note 213 with related text. Note that the *inclusio* between chs. 4 and 13 strongly suggests that the interveneing nine chapters on the virtues are like the wandering in the desert as Israel/brothers seek the promised land/Christ. The typological association is most likely intentional.

[242] LMj 13.5.4 (*Fontes*, 893; FA:ED 2, 634): *Dominus ipse, qui signacula illa secrete impresserat, miracula quaedam aperte per ipsa monstravit, ut illorum occulta et mira vis stigmatum manifesta pateret claritate signorum.*

cause. Bonaventure then reports three miracle accounts, of which only the first can be found in the earlier sources.[243] All three concern the stigmata's power over nature.[244]

On another level, ch. 13 is similar to ch. 4 in that it presents information in a parallel manner,[245] which, as mentioned,[246] Bonaventure highlights via an explicit mention of the triple way: "The sacred marks were imprinted by the power of Him Who purifies, illumines, and inflames."[247] Purification points back to the three miracle accounts just reported and forward to those contained in the *Miracula*.[248] Illumination points back to Brother Illuminato's recognition of the Lord's sacrament, and forward to the litany of witnesses to the stigmata: numerous unnamed brothers, some unnamed cardinals, Pope Alexander IV, Clare along with "innumerable laymen," and Francis' most intimate companions, who remain unnamed.[249] Perfection comes via the seven *nunc/iam* (now) passages and the concluding *ecce/iam* (now behold) clause that instruct the brothers on how they, like Francis, can reach perfection through the love of Christ's cross—a love that inflames (*inflammat*) their desire.

The analysis of the triple way micro-structure ends with an examination of the last section of ch. 13. Therein Bonaventure invokes Francis' "presence" as he simultaneously consummates the nine chapters on the virtues, resumes the six historical chapters, and exhorts his brothers, Francis' brothers, to live a life of "Gospel perfection." In effect, Bonaventure invites his brothers to encounter Francis' presence *now* by embracing Christ's cross as Francis did. Bonaventure is confident that the *sacramentum* of

---

[243] Part of LMj 13.6, the healing of the diseased cattle, is lifted from 3C 18. The stories about the hailstorms (13.7.1–2) and the wintertime warmth (13.7.3–6) are unique to the LMj.

[244] Specifically, the tree episodes recount healing cattle, stopping hailstorms, and warming the air during wintertime. In contrast, the miracle accounts in LMj *Miracula* 1.2–7 all concern people.

[245] For the parallelism in ch. 4, see note 203 and related text.

[246] See note 224 and related text.

[247] LMj 13.7.7 (*Fontes*, 895; FA:ED 2, 635): *sacra illa signacula illius impressa fuisse virtute, qui operatione seraphica purgat, illuminat et inflammat.*

[248] See note 158.

[249] Bonaventure does not name any of Francis' companions, although the earlier sources explicitly identify Elias (1C 95, LJS 63), Rufino (1C 95, LJS 63, 3C 4), and Pacifico (2 C 137). Considering Elias' downfall within the order, it is understandable why Bonaventure simply refers to Francis' vicar, but the exclusion of the others highlights the idea that Bonaventure introduces Brother Illuminato, who is not mentioned in the earlier sources as an eyewitness, as a literary invention to describe witnesses, past and present, as "illumined" by what they saw/believe.

Francis' stigmata will lead the brothers to "the summit of Gospel perfection." Imitation, for Francis and his brothers, ends at a desire for the cross, that is, a desire to become lesser for and before others.

Bonaventure employs two literary devices as he invokes Francis. On the one hand, he employs, for the only time in the text, the second person singular—you—to directly address Francis as if he were present. On the other hand, he emphasizes the move into the "present" with the eightfold repetition of "now" (*nunc/iam*).[250] The effect: Francis becomes present to the brothers to instruct them by allowing the brothers to contemplate his sacred wounds.[251] Nevertheless, it is Bonaventure who does the teaching, and his instruction employs military imagery. Francis is Christ's knight who carries the cruciform standard for others to follow. Thus, just as Francis follows Christ, the brothers should follow Francis. Accordingly, the first three *nunc/iam* clauses explain the dual discipleship between Francis and the brothers, which the reading now makes "present."[252] Francis' stigmata reveal Christ, "the invincible leader," who "will overcome all adversaries," and the response of the brothers, "the divine army," is to be "re-energized."[253] Likewise, Francis' "words and deeds" will be "rightly accepted as authentic" by the brothers who "must keep a devoted affectivity."[254] Lastly, Francis' stigmata will confirm the brothers' faith, elevate their hope, and ignite their charity.[255] In short, Francis' virtues, as exemplified by his words and deeds, will lead the brothers to the reception of the theological virtues.

The next four *iam* clauses reveal from where Bonaventure derives the military imagery: Francis' own conversion. The seven visions of the cross[256]

---

[250] *Nunc* is employed once first, followed by seven *iam* statements.

[251] LMj 13.8. With the two literary devices, Bonaventure attempts to make Francis' spirit present to the brothers in a manner similar to the historical accounts of Francis' presence to the brothers in ch. 4; see note 203 and related text.

[252] By reading (*legenda*) the text, the brothers' words make Francis present; by imitating what they read, the brothers embody Francis' presence. Hence, it is in the dual dynamic of word and deed that the *Legenda major* functions as a performative text with the intended outcome of making Francis present to the brothers and the brothers present to Francis through the Rule, their virtue, and their acceptance of Christ's cross, which is the full embrace of mendicancy, i.e., being lesser than others.

[253] LMj 13.9.1–2 (*Fontes*, 897; FA:ED 2, 637): *invictissimi Ducis (. . .) omnes adversarios superabis (. . .) omnes pugnatores divini exercitus animentur!*

[254] LMj 13.9.3–4 (*Fontes*, 897; FA:ED 2, 637): *verba et facta (. . .) authentica merito (. . .) acceptentur! (. . .) esse tenetur affectione devotus.*

[255] LMj 13.9.6.

[256] LMj 13.10.1–5: *beginning* (1) vision Christ's cross on weapons (1.3), (2) vision of Christ fastened to a cross (1.5), (3) San Damiano crucifix (2.1), *process* (4) Brother Sylvester's vision of the cross (3.5), (5) Brother Pacifico's vision of the cross (4.9), (6) Brother Monaldo's

identify Francis as the leader of Christ's soldiers. Note that the seven visions describe the process of Francis' conversion: *principio, progressu, finem*. Francis' ongoing conversion, unto complete conformity with the crucified, identifies Francis as the angel of the sixth seal who bears the sign of the living God.[257] Yet, the exclusivity of the stigmata distinguishes Francis from the brothers. He has reached the final *transitus* of his conversion, the brothers are still *in via*.

Therefore, with the last *ecce iam* clause Bonaventure exhorts his brothers to follow after Francis who is their example (*exemplum*). Like the *Itinerarium*, Francis' ongoing conversion was marked by six steps that climaxed in the *transitus* of the stigmata.[258] The *Iinerarium* explicitly states what the *Legenda major* implies:

> [Francis] is set forth as an example (*exemplum*) of perfect contemplation, just as previously he had been of action (…) so that, through him, more by example than by word, God might invite all truly spiritual men (*omnes viros vere spirituales*) to this *transitus* and this ecstasy of mind.[259]

In short, Bonaventure presents Francis as the embodiment of "Gospel perfection," and admonishes his brothers to devoutly, faithfully, and humbly follow Francis' demonstration of Christian wisdom.[260] But how?

Not surprisingly, Bonaventure again structures this most important section of the *Legenda major* according to a 3×3 framework. First, the stigmata confirm Francis' virtues and therefore can lead others to faith, hope and charity (purgation). Second, the stigmata confirm the beginning, process and end of Francis' conversion and therefore correctly identify him as an eschatological figure who reveals the truth (illumination).[261] Third, the stigmata confirm that Francis reached "the summit of Gospel perfection" and therefore his "demonstration of Christian wisdom" should be

---

vision at the Chapter of Arles (4.9), *end* (7) stigmata (13.3). Note that the first three happen to Francis, the next three to brothers, and the last to Francis.

257 See Stanislao Da Campagnola, *L'angelo del sesto sigillo e l'alter Christus* (Rome: 1971).

258 See *Itin.* prol. 3, 1.1–7, and 7.1 (5, 295, 296–298, 312).

259 *Itin.* 7.3 (5, p. 312): *positus est ut exemplum perfectae contemplationis; sicut prius fuerat actionis (…) ut omnes viros vere spirituales Deus per eum invitaret ad huiusmodi transitum et mentis excessum magis exemplo quam verbo.*

260 In contrast, brothers who do not follow Francis' example of Gospel perfection reject, attack, and belittle his demonstration of Christian wisdom. *Itinerarium* prol. 3 explicitly identifies the Seraph's six wings with the six illuminations of Christian wisdom (5, 295).

261 To understand the eschatological imagery, it is important to remember that it is the angel of the sixth seal who marks the one-hundred and forty-four thousand. In other words, Francis, like the Angel, is charged with the task of preparing the elect.

accepted with devotion, faith and humility by everyone (perfection). In effect, these 3x3 triads represent the stigmata's "seraphic activity" that purifies, illumines, and inflames those who desire to follow Francis as Francis desired to follow Christ. The point is that what God impressed upon Francis' flesh can and should be expressed by the brothers' ardent desire now, which is the only way they will authentically live the Rule.[262] Bonaventure does not call his brothers to a literal imitation of Francis' stigmata, but to embody what Francis desired, "to conform himself to [Christ] in every way."[263] Such imitation would lead the brothers, like Francis, to "the apex of Gospel perfection."[264] Hence, the stigmata are "worthy of complete acceptance,"[265] not simply in a notional sense, but in the Pauline sense that Bonaventure cites (1 Tim. 4:8–9; 1:15): "Exercise yourself in godliness (*pietas*), for, while physical training is of some value, godliness is valuable in every way, holding promise for both the present life and the life to come."[266] The brothers cannot physically conform to the stigmata, but they can imitate Francis' example of godliness, which, for Bonaventure, is the same as imitating Christ, the source and "demonstration of Christian wisdom."[267]

Conclusion

This essay makes five claims that impact how one should interpret the *Legenda major*. First, Bonaventure primary wrote the *Legenda major* for liturgical reasons. The brothers and the Church lacked a life of St Francis fitting for the celebration of Francis' feast as a double octave. Hence, following in the tradition of Thomas of Celano with *The Life of Saint Francis*

---

[262] This is yet another example of how Bonaventure interprets the stigmata as God's confirmation of everything that Francis did and taught, especially as envisioned by the Rule.

[263] LMj 13.1.6 (*Fontes*, 890; FA:ED 2, 631): *investigans beneplacitum Dei, cui se conformare omnimode summo peroptabat ardore.*

[264] LMj 13.10 (*Fontes*, 898; FA:ED 2, 639): *evangelicae perfectionis apicem.* Note how ch. 13 begins with conforming to Christ and ends with Gospel perfection. In effect, the source and the summit are identlical yet distinct: Gospel perfection is conforming to Chirst and conforming to Christ is Gospel perfection. Bonaventure presents Francis as a *sacramentum* of this reciprocal assertion.

[265] LMj 13.10.9 (*Fontes*, 898; FA:ED 2, 639): *omni acceptione condigna.*

[266] Vulgate: *nam corporalis exercitatio ad modicum utilis est pietas autem ad omnia utilis est promissionem habens vitae quae nunc est et futurae fidelis sermo et omni acceptione dignus.*

[267] LMj 13.10.8 (*Fontes*, 898; FA:ED 2, 639): *demonstrationem hanc christianae sapientiae.*

(c. 1229) and the accompanying *The Legend for Use in Choir* (c. 1230–1232) and Julian of Speyer with *The Divine Office of Saint Francis* (c. 1228–1232)[268] and the accompanying *The Life of Saint Francis* (c. 1232–1235), Bonaventure adheres to the praxis of producing two genre of *legendae* that serve two distinct but related purposes/audiences within close proximity to each other: the explicitly liturgical *Legenda minor* for the celebration of Francis' feast as a double octave, and the longer *Legenda major* that was more suitable for refectory reading and other public readings by the brothers or other groups within the Church more broadly.

Second, intertextual analysis of the *Legenda major* with the earlier hagiographical sources demonstrates that Bonaventure limited his sources to the texts produced by Thomas of Celano and Julian of Speyer. In addition to 1C/LCh, 2C and LJS, Bonaventure also utilized 3C to produce a book of Francis' miracles to promote the saint's cult, which presented the miracles as signs of God's continued activity through the *vir Dei*. Bonaventure did not utilize Julian of Speyer's *The Divine Office of Saint Francis*, because it was still in use in 1260.

Third, conflicts facing the Franciscan order inform how Bonaventure composed the *Legenda major*. Politics were cetaintly at play, but the politics were primarily entangled with controversy between the seculars and mendicants at Paris and throughout Christianity via secular bishops who had mendicants ministering in their dioceses.[269] To pinpoint the issue:

---

[268] Julian of Speyer's *Officium Rhythmicum Sancti Francisci* was still in use and remained in use after Bonaventure wrote his two *legendae*; see note 35 and related text.

[269] Hence, the later embittered politics over poverty that erupted after Bonaventure's death is an anachronistic context for the *Legenda major*. The growth of the *Zelanti* or "Spirituals" was a response, at least in part, to Nicholas III's *Exiit qui seminat* (1279) that defined *usus pauper* as *moderatus usus*, and Martin IV's *Exultantes in domino* (1283) that turned a "moderate" interpretation of poverty into a "relaxed" one by decreeing that the *nuntii* or procurators who had handled money/property on behalf of the brothers since Gregory IX's *Quo elongati* (1230) became deputies of the brothers themselves instead of external ecclesiastical agents. Thus, the brothers, not the pope or bishop, could now appoint and dismiss *nuntii* at will. In effect, the brothers owned property because the brothers directly controlled the procurators who managed the possessions. It is in the midst of this mendicant conflict that Ubertino of Casale in *The Tree of the Crucified Life of Jesus* (1305) first complains about the lost "rolls" (*rotuli*) omitted by Bonaventure in his work (i.e., a probable reference to the *Legenda major* and the decision of the Chapter of Paris in 1266 to delete/destroy the other extant writings about Francis). Later, following the purge of the Spirituals by John XXII in 1217, Angelo Clarino explicitly demonizes Bonaventure in the *History of the Seven Tribulations* (c. 1321–1322), which appears later in the widely circulated *Fioretti* 48 (c. 1328–1337). No-doubt the laxist leaning expositions on the Rule attributed to Bonaventure like, the *Determinationes quaestionum circa Regulam* (8, 337–374) and the *Expositio super Regulam Fratrum Minorum* (8, 391–437), implicated him as a laxist for

the ecclesiastical status of the Franciscan order was being questioned by powerful opponents. In response, Bonaventure presents a saint cleansed of earlier episodes that present Francis or the order negatively. On the one hand, sensitive to the accusations of William of Saint-Amour and his allies, Bonaventure reduced Francis' relationships with women to a level of nonexistence. He also eliminates predictions of the downfall of the order so as to avoid providing enemies of the order with ammunition for their attacks. On the other hand, responding to heated attacks from without and lukewarm laxity from within, Bonventure upholds poverty and almsgiving as authentic expressions of Francis' vision that received papal approval from both Innocent III and Honorius III. The very first line of the prologue addresses the *Legenda major* "to all those who are truly humble and lovers of holy poverty."[270] And ch. 7 on Francis' love of poverty begins with the important description: "Truly, from the beginning of his religious life until his death, his wealth was a tunic, a cord, and underwear, with these he was content."[271] Likewise, Bonaventure highlights Francis as a true practitioner of "evangelical perfection" more strongly than any earlier hagiographical source. The emphasis on "evangelical perfection" reverberates against those from outside the order who doubted the validity of such a life. It also attempted to resonate with those inside the order by inspiring the brothers to imitate their brother Francis better.

Fourth, the *Legenda major*'s first line invites the hearer/reader "to learn by [Francis'] example" and thereby "to live in conformity with Christ."[272] Bonaventure calls his brothers to imitation of their brother Francis so that they can truly live the Rule and fulfill their apostolic commission to minister in the hurch by living and preaching Gospel perfection. Bonaventure's

---

the Spirituals who followed. Yet, these two "spurious" or "doubtful" works paint an inaccurate picture of Bonaventure's generalate (Monti, *Writings*, 6–7). They were likely written after Bonaventure's death in 1274 and the reinterpretations of mendicancy that culminated in *Exultantes in domino* in 1283 mentioned above. Note that during this same time in the 1270s and 1280s the ranks of the Spirituals grew rapidly (Nimo, *Reform and Division*, 108).

[270] LMj prol. 1.1 (Fontes, 777; FA:ED 2, 525): *omnibus vere humilibus et sanctae paupertatis amicis*.

[271] LMj 7.1.5 (*Fontes*, 833; FA:ED 2, 577): *Revera ipse a principio religionis usque ad mortem tunica* [2C adds *sola*], *chordula et femoralibus dives, his contentus fuit*; compare 2C 55.8. Other earlier sources identify this statement as Francis' intention regarding the brothers: AC 101/LP 66. Similar phraseology appears in later sources too, e.g., the Leonine *Intention of the Rule* 1, 5, 12 and Sabatier, *Speculum Perfectionis* 1.

[272] LMj prol. 1.1 (*Fontes*, 777; FA:ED 2, 525): *ipsius erudiuntur exemplo (. . .) Christo conformiter vivere*.

First Encyclical Letter (1257) reveals that he was cognizent that the order was growing quantitatively, but that, for some of the brothers, the order's evangelical spirit was also qualitatively eroding. With the *Legenda major*, Bonaventure calls his brothers to follow the affective journey of Francis, that is, to desire what Francis desired. Such transformation of desire would renew the Franciscan *religio* by allowing the spirit of the founder (*Legenda*) to inspire the letter of the order (*Regula*) and vice versa.[273] In an attempt to coordinate the spirit and the letter, Bonaventure presents an "Ideal Francis" to inspire his brothers to imitate him so as to live a "form of life" that fulfilled the ideal of the Rule of 1224.

Fifth, if the medium is the message, then the structure of the *Legenda major* indeed holds the interpretive key for understanding Bonaventure's theological interpretation of Francis. Specifically, the triple way of purgation, illumination and perfection structures Bonaventure's rewriting of Francis' life on three interrelated levels: the macro-structure that organizes the texts overarching threefold division (see Table 1); the intermediate-stuctures that organize the texts' historical and thematic chapters (see Tables 2–3); and the micro-structure that organizes the narrative within every chapter except ch. 15 (see Table 4). As evidenced by the two chapters selected for analysis of the micro-structures (ch. 4, *On the Progress of the Order Under His Hand and the Confirmation of the Rule* and ch. 13, *The Sacred Stigmata*), Bonaventure frames the imitation of Francis' virtues (chs. 5–13) with the Rule (ch. 4) and the stigmata (ch. 13). According to the narrative, if the brothers desire to follow Francis, even though they are separated from Francis,[274] they must live the Rule (ch. 4), but if they desire to live the Rule, they must desire to imitate Francis' virtues (chs. 5–12), and if the brothers desire to embody Francis' virtues, they must make Francis present now (*nunc/iam*) among them by imitating his seraphic desire, a desire that transforms the lover into the one loved. Hence, Bonaventure resolves the tension between admiring

---

[273] Of course, Bonaventure worked to clarify the letter of the Rule by systematically collecting the order's existing legislation with the Constitutions of Narbonne (1260), which helped establish the pattern of Franciscan life. Bonaventure couples this work on the "letter" with the two *legendae*, which attempt to shape the order's collective spirit by informing the desire of all the brothers' according to an imitation of Francis, who was the author of the Rule by divine revelation (LMj 4.11; see note 206 and related text).

[274] The brothers include both those of Francis' own generation (ch. 4) and those who joined the order after his death, who are the actual audience of the *Legenda major* who hear the narrative "now" (*nunc/iam*) (ch. 13).

Francis and following him by imitation via a spiritual askesis whereby the brothers, through the graced activity of purgation, illumination and perfection, transform themselves into hierarchic men, thereby conforming themselves, like Francis, to Christ. For Bonaventure, admiration is the object of knowledge, imitation is the object of desire. The *Legenda major* attempts both.[275]

[275] See note 252.

BONAVENTURE'S DEFENSE OF MENDICANCY

Kevin L. Hughes

Saint Bonaventure devoted a significant amount of work over a rather extended period of time to defending the practice of voluntary apostolic poverty against its opponents. And yet, his relationship to the idea and practice of Franciscan poverty is complex. Such an admission may seem already to give away too much: how complex can one's relation be to something so apparently straightforward as the simple poverty of the Poverello, Saint Francis of Assisi? Is not then a confession of "complexity" already a diminishment or a capitulation? Such accusations against Bonaventure are not new; indeed, shortly after his death, Angelo Clareno does not hesitate to portray Bonaventure in a dream as a kind of hypocritical harpy, one who betrays the legacy of Francis and whose steel talons pierce the flesh of his friend and predecessor, the zealous John of Parma.

Although now widely acknowledged as the "most successful" of the ministers general in the century following Francis's death, Bonaventure's reputation as a traitor to the legacy of Francis lurks as a kind of shadow history in the Order. It is very likely the cause of the considerable delay in Bonaventure's canonization,[1] and it persists today even in the punned title of Jacques Dalarun's *La Malavventura di Francesco d'Assisi* (playing on "Bonaventura").[2] That Bonaventure's vision differs from that of Francis cannot be doubted; whether it constitutes a betrayal of Francis is more difficult to discern. I contend that Bonaventure's legacy on the question of mendicancy combines careful and discerning judgments of practical reason and a tenacious defense of evangelical poverty against its detractors with a profound deepening of theological reflection on the sense of mendicancy in relation to the Franciscan mission and the life of discipleship of Christ. I intend in this essay to explore Bonaventure's relation to mendicancy in a threefold manner: (1) A deeper survey of the ways in which Bonaventure has been received and, (2) his defense of mendicancy

---

[1] Andre Vauchez, "The Canonizations of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure: Why a Two-Century Gap between Them?" *Greyfriars Review* 12 (1998): 193–210.

[2] Published in English translation as *The Misadventure of Francis of Assisi*, trans. Edmund Hagman, OFM Cap. (St. Bonaventure, NY: 2002).

against the secular (and non-secular?) masters ("Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection," "Letter to an Unknown Master," *Apologia Pauperum*). (3) I will then conclude with a brief discussion of the theology of mendicancy (*Itinerarium, Collations in Hexaëmeron*).

Bonaventure and the Minorite Ideal

Bonaventure's reputation as "second founder" of the Order may stem as much from his legislative work as minister general as from his theological vision. In the "Narbonne Constitutions," Bonaventure compiled and edited the work of the eleven previous general chapters of the order. During his time as minister general, then, we see perhaps the full flowering of the Lesser Brothers as an order, as a religious institution with a particular vocation. The romantic streak in all of us tends to read this move from charisma to institution, a universal sociological process so well described by Max Weber, as a story of decline and fall. In this case, where the charismatic founder is so cherished and controversial a figure, that temptation abounds all the more. It is here that we can place the shadow history of the Minorite Order, from the pen of Angelo Clareno all the way down to Giovanni Miccoli, Chiara Frugoni, and Jacques Dalarun. Angelo portrayed Bonaventure as a traitor to Francis. In his *Historia*, Angelo relates a conversation he had with James of Massa. James tells him of a dream he had in which Bonaventure appears with steel talons for fingernails and attacks his predecessor John of Parma. In the vision, Bonaventure is one of several friars who fail to drink deeply of the cup passed around by Francis—a clear indication that he will accept only part of Francis's legacy and will work to eliminate all who drink the whole cup. Paul Sabatier's assessment of Bonaventure is similar. Bonaventure, says Sabatier, "has not understood him whose disciple he wanted and believed himself to be."[3] In our own day, Jacques Dalarun's assessment is more reserved and more carefully documented, but the spirit is much the same. For Dalarun, it is Bonaventure above all who suppresses the radical elements in the memory of Francis, especially "passages that recall Francis's distrust of books, study and knowledge . . ."[4]

---

[3] Paul Sabatier, *Examen de quelque travaux récents sur les Opuscules de Saint François, Opuscules de Critique Historique*, fasc. X. (Paris: 1904), 161 n. 1.

[4] Dalarun, *Misadventure*, 250.

Dalarun sees in Bonaventure a man who focuses upon a particular element in the charism of Francis and makes all other elements subordinate to it. For Bonaventure, the role of a friar was to preach, and from this focus a host of conclusions follow. As Dalarun says, "Christ and Francis chose preaching; therefore the Friars Minor must preach; therefore they must read scripture and the commentaries; for convenience they may use books, as long as they harbor no feeling of proprietorship, they may possess them, and so forth."[5] By this "logic of preaching," Bonaventure is led to allow the friars to study, to make use of books, etc. Bonaventure tends to smooth out the tensions and oppositions present in the "historical Francis" in favor of a neater, cleaner vision of the saint. It is this "happy adventure" (buona ventura) of Francis that Dalarun wishes to balance with a messier *malavventura*, a 'misadventure,' of Francis which will leave the rough edges exposed. Nevertheless, Dalarun knows that Bonaventure's logic does not lead him into a lax approach to poverty as such. It is rather that he re-positions poverty in the vocation of the Order.

For some scholars who are more well-disposed to Bonaventure, this "repositioning" represents the sane voice of moderation and compromise. For John Moorman, whose classic history of the Order became a benchmark for many twentieth-century scholars, "Bonaventura glosses over or suppresses many things for the sake of reconciling conflicting parties in the Order or to bring credit to the Order in the eyes of the world."[6] In this account, Bonaventure seems to be a political moderate, the great compromiser between factions in an increasingly fractious Order. Scholars have imagined a community of "proto-spirituals," uniting perhaps around the figure of Leo, who struggle against the progressive institutionalization of the Order. On the other hand, on this view, there are those who have grown lax in their observance. Bonaventure, on this account, stands in the middle, barely holding the two forces together. And after his death, things fall apart. This view, too, has a distinguished early history: it seems to be Dante's view, where the beatified Bonaventure confesses that only a few maintain the zealous ideal of their founder:

> I readily admit, should one search our volume
> leaf by leaf, one still could find some pages
> where one might read, "What once I was, I am."

[5] Dalarun, *Misadventure*, 241.
[6] J.R.H. Moorman, *The Sources for the Life of Francis* (Manchester: 1940).

> But this will not come from Casale or Acquasparta,
> for those from there come to the Rule
> either to flee it or to constrict it further.[7]

The heavenly Bonaventure here condemns Ubertino of Casale, among the rigorist Spiritual Franciscans, as well as Matthew of Acquasparta, representing the "establishment" within the Order. For Dante, Bonaventure stands even in death as the moderate poised between Casale and Acquasparta, between extremism and laxity.

However, David Burr, among others, has demonstrated that this portrait of Bonventure as the moderate compromiser is overdrawn. It is an anachronism projected back onto Bonaventure's epoch from an admittedly more troubled time at the turn of the fourteenth century. If we examine Bonaventure's writings *ad intra*, directed to his fellow friars, as David Burr has done, we find no evidence of any attempt to restrain a radical "proto-spiritual" faction. Rather, we discover Bonaventure consistently and persistently lamenting the laxity of the Order, encouraging his brothers to a more rigorous observance of the rule even as he offers a vigorous defense of poverty as an "evangelical perfection" against their external opponents. In this account, the complexity of Bonaventure's vision emerges from the sheer reality of a vast community of men, inspired and energized by the vision of Francis but, for that very reason, burdened with tremendous pastoral responsibility in the Church. Such a reality required Bonaventure to articulate a vision of evangelical poverty determined not by a fixed standard of observance, but applied in the exercise of practical wisdom to the particular circumstances in which the brothers may find themselves. Such an exercise of practical wisdom need not compromise evangelical perfection, since, as Burr says, "it is defined by the role one is called upon to perform, and it requires taking only what is necessary for the fulfillment of that role."[8] Rather than providing a "moderate" position on poverty, Bonaventure develops a means by which one might observe evangelical poverty radically, even as one meets the pastoral needs of the Church. Indeed, in almost every dimension, Bonaventure's position on poverty most resembles that of Peter Olivi, the Spiritual at the center of later controversy.

In surveying recent scholarship, one notes that Bonaventure's teaching on poverty very rarely receives independent consideration on its own

---

[7] Dante, *Paradiso* 7, trans. Robert and Jean Hollander (New York: 2007), 121–126.
[8] David Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty* (Philadelphia: 1989), 25.

merits. Usually, Bonaventure is studied either in relation to the "historical Francis" question, and so is measured by what precedes him, or with respect to the later Spirituals, and so takes on the role of a "forerunner" or "precursor." Perhaps this is inevitable, and, of course, much good scholarship has emerged from such study. However, with the exception of Burr, such contextualization has tended to obscure Bonaventure's particular and unique approach. It tends to cast Bonaventure in the "in-between," as a figure of compromise, whether that term is understood positively in terms of agreement or negatively as betrayal. Following Burr, a different picture of Bonaventure emerges when one explores what Bonaventure actually says. Burr has explored this with the writings directed *ad intra*, writings for his own Minorite brothers. I hope that this essay may complement this effort with an exploration of the writings *ad extra*, in Bonaventure's defense of mendicancy against its secular critics. Let this essay be an initial movement that will encourage other scholars to pursue the question further.

Bonaventure's Defense of Mendicancy

The Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection *(1254–1255)*

Bonaventure's *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection* are delivered in the midst of conflict.[9] Secular masters at the University of Paris had never encouraged the presence of the new mendicant Orders since their arrival in the early thirteenth century. In 1253, they objected to the mendicant Orders' assertion of rights in the faculty of theology and they attempted to block the inception of Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas into the faculty.

[9] For the deeper background to this issue, see: Decima L. Douie, "St. Bonaventura's Part in the Conflict between Seculars and Mendicants in Paris," in Jacques Guy Bougerol (ed.), *S. Bonaventura: 1274–1974*, vol. 2 (Rome: 1974), 585–612. Dufeil's *Guillaume de Saint-Amour* is the best monograph concerning the controversy, and the works of Andrew Traver update Dufeil's work and provide further critical texts for the study of the period. See especially Andrew Traver, "Rewriting History? The Parisian Secular Masters' *Apologia* of 1254," *History of Universities* 15 (1997–1999), 24. Georg Wieland provides a different approach to the controversy, arguing that one consequence of the mendicant controversy was the strengthening of the Arts faculty. If this is true, it is somewhat ironic that a controversy that may have had its roots in the licensing of Bonaventure and certainly found one of its final moments in his licensing, led to the strengthening of the faculty he would do so much to combat later in his own life. See Wieland, "Der Mendikantenstreit und die Grenzen von Theologie und Philosophie," in Maarten J.F.M. Hoenen, J.H. Josef Schneer, and Georg Wieland (ed.), *Philosophy and Learning in the Middle Ages* (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance) 6 (Leiden: 1995), 17–28.

After much argument, their chairs in the faculty of theology at Paris had been mandated by papal decree over the objections of the secular masters in 1254. However, that same year saw the publication of Friar Gerard di Borgo San Donnino's *Liber introductorius ad Evangelium Aeternum*, the radical Franciscan Joachite compilation that announced the beginning of the third and final *status* of history and proclaimed the writings of the apocalyptic prophet Joachim of Fiore (d. 1204) as the "Eternal Gospel" that succeeded and completed the Old and New Testaments. Gerard's vision stood at the outer limits of orthodoxy, but, as such, it amplified and extended an apocalyptic spirituality already common to many of the Minorite brothers, including the minister general, John of Parma.

Joachim of Fiore had foretold a new *status* or age of history, an age of the Holy Spirit, in which the very structures of the church would be "spiritualized" and made contemplative. This coming *ecclesia spiritualis* or *ecclesia contemplativa* would be heralded by two communities of *viri spirituales*, "spiritual men," who would usher in the third *status.* The Franciscans and Dominicans were founded soon after Joachim's death, and these twin champions of evangelical mission found much of themselves foretold in Joachim's writings. The Franciscans, in particular, found in their founder Francis an "angel of the sixth seal" of the Apocalypse, who himself brought about this new moment in the history of the Church. These convictions, widely held among the Franciscans, made the Order as a whole vulnerable to "guilt by association" with the heresy of Gerard's *Eternal Gospel.* Although the work was swiftly condemned, and although John of Parma was swift to distance the Minorites from the heretical positions espoused in it, Gerard's *Eternal Gospel* radicalized the debate in Paris between the mendicants and the seculars. Penn Szittya notes:

> The appearance of the Eternal Gospel altered radically and permanently the secular clergy's perception of the friars, from a political to a theological perspective. It changed the background against which they were seen, from the mundane, confusing world of Paris and the university to the larger, more frightening but more comprehensible world of eschatological mythology. The friars ceased to be seen so much as competitors for ecclesiastical privileges and academic honors and became forerunners of the Antichrist (. . .). The lens of history had suddenly changed.[10]

[10] Penn R. Szittya, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton: 1986), 30–31.

In 1254, the secular Parisian master William of Saint-Amour published his *Liber de Antichristo et eius ministris*, followed in 1256 by *Tractatus de periculis novissimorum temporum.*[11] In this double assault on the mendicants, William argued that the Dominican and Franciscan friars were the "false prophets" promised before the End. The sign of their deception was their proposal of a life of evangelical perfection, above all their vow of poverty. William's attacks cited Gerard's *Eternal Gospel* as evidence of the heretical innovations among the mendicants, and he argued that this life, far from being evangelical, was actually contrary to the teaching of the Gospel. It was "false prophecy" that heralded the arrival of Antichrist. The attack provoked sharp responses from both mendicant Orders: Thomas Aquinas directly refuted the accusations of the *Tractatus*, and he was joined by Thomas of York of the Minorites. Bonaventure's *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection* may be the first volley in defense of the mendicants, or they may have preceded William's initial publication. If they are the former, they show remarkable restraint, as they make no mention of William or the dispute. Nonetheless, Bonaventure's role in defending the mendicants was taken by later mendicant chroniclers to be decisive: "With God's help, Friar Bonaventure, Master of Theology, together with other mendicant friars, convicted the false wise men by making the truth burst forth."[12]

It is noteworthy, then, that here, as in his later *Apologia Pauperum*, Bonaventure defends not only mendicancy but the life of evangelical perfection as such. There are four major questions addressed, on humility, poverty, continence, and obedience, with the second, third and fourth questions each divided into three articles. The first question addresses humility as the theological foundation of the three evangelical vows, and then each vow is taken in series. The first question, on humility, is whether Christian perfection is marked by the subjection of self, internally and externally, out of love for Christ. Bonaventure has already treated this question as a young scholar in his commentary on the *Sentences*,[13] but he brings these arguments together here to anchor his inquiry into the vows. An assault on the mendicants, Bonaventure suggests, is an assault

[11] William of Saint-Amour, *De periculis novissimi temporis.* In William of Saint-Amour, *Opera omnia* (Constance: 1632).

[12] *Chronica de fr. Eleemosyna, Bibl. Nat. Paris, lat. 5006, fol. 152v*; cited in J.G. Bougerol, OFM, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson, NJ: 1964), 118.

[13] Cf., III Sent., d. 35, q.1 (III, pp. 772–775); d. 26, a. 1, q. 3 (III, pp. 560–562); d. 34, p. 1, a. 1, q. 3 (III, pp. 741–743); IV Sent., d. 33, a. 2, q. 1 (IV, pp. 753–55).

on the Christian claim that humility itself is a virtue. Implicit in all the objections is that humility is an act contrary to the goodness of human nature, and thus is a desecration.[14] Bonaventure defends the subjection of self in humility against accusations that it is against nature, immoderate, an insult to God's good creation, disordered, and so on.

In sum, the majority of the secular critique of "evangelical perfection," as Bonaventure lets it be heard in the positions *ad oppositum*, can be reduced to the sense that the mendicants' radical interpretation of the evangelical counsels asks too much of human beings and asks it wrongly. It diminishes human dignity and contends with all the best aspirations of human nature in its natural seeking of the good. For Bonaventure, such an account fails to take sufficient account of the damage done by sin:

> Since a product has been made by God out of nothing and has been spoiled in humans from the beginning by original sin, it has in itself something of deiformity by reason of its being made by God, something of defect by reason of its origin, and something of deformity by reason of the vice to which it is subject. It must be respected by reason of its deiformity since it reflects a vestige, image, and divine likeness. But it may also be disdained by reason of its defect and reputed as contemptible by reason of its deformity, not to God's disgrace but to God's honor, because honor is removed only by the deformity of vice and sin.[15]

In qu. 1, the last two objections merit particular attention. They seem to add something new to this general sentiment. Objection 14 reads, "And so you, who present humility in appearance, either you consider yourselves humble or you do not. If you do, you thus attribute to yourself a noble virtue, and so you are proud. If you do not, then when external habit shows you to be humble, you bear one habit in your soul and another in appearance, and so you are a hypocrite." In other words, the mendicant finds himself in a double-bind when he commits himself publicly to the life of humility. He is either proud of his humility (and therefore not humble), or he is not living up to his public commitment in the secret of his heart (and therefore is a hypocrite). Public profession of the life of humility seems to bind one to sin, and so it must be inconsistent with the

---

[14] One wonders if we see here, already, the kind of Aristotelian humanism that Alain de Libera finds condemned in 1277. See Alain de Libera, *Penser au Moyen Age* (Paris: 1991), especially chs. 4–6. Certainly by the time of the *Apologia Pauperum* and the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, we see Bonaventure connecting these assaults on mendicancy with the emergent Aristotelian ethos of the School of Arts at the University of Paris.

[15] *Perf. evang.*, q 1 ad 5, (V, p. 45).

Gospel. Bonaventure responds that the humiliation of the mendicants is a sign not of humility already acquired, but rather of the desire to strive to acquire humility, "and this indeed ought to be and is in every good human person who bears religion in his heart."

The last objection is ecclesiological. "Each part that does not conform itself to the whole is deformed. Singularities of habits seem to disfigure the good form of the church, and thus they should not be viewed as perfect virtue or Christian perfection." In response to this, Bonaventure draws a distinction between equality and right order. Citing Augustine, he notes that "if all things are equal, they are not all things." Differences of virtue are a fact not to be ignored; no one should pretend that harmony requires equality. Harmony and beauty is best found in the multiformity and proper distinction of habits and vocations within the church, which, when rightly ordered, adorn the universal church. This argument presents the kernel of an ecclesial vision that Bonaventure would only describe in full flower in his last work, the *Collations in Hexaëmeron*. Here, in the *Disputed Questions*, he presents only a basic argument for the plurality of hierarchies within the Church; in the *Hexaëmeron*, nearly twenty years later, he would present complementary hierarchies of office and of practice, woven into a vivid ecclesial tapestry. In sum, Bonaventure's first question has carved out a theological space within the church for those committed to complete interior and exterior self-subjection. Such self-subjection is a nonnegotiable foundation of Christian perfection, which is itself a counsel for "those who ascend to the summit of perfection."

The second question addresses evangelical poverty directly. Bonaventure divides his treatment of poverty into three distinct articles. First, he treats poverty as total renunciation, and then he addresses mendicancy, or begging. Lastly, as a sort of corollary to the second article, Bonaventure considers whether mendicant friars are obliged to take on manual labor. Tackling the first question, poverty as renunciation, Bonaventure advances thirty-two arguments in support of his claim that total renunciation of property, both individually and in community, is part of evangelical perfection. The fourteen scriptural warrants are what one might expect—Christ's invitation to discipleship, the lilies of the field, etc.—as are the patristic authorities he quotes: Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, John Chrysostom, and Bernard of Clairvaux are all summoned to support this radical adherence to many of the same scriptural texts he has already cited. The seven arguments from reason that follow begin by invoking Augustine's grand narrative contrast, "Two loves built two

cities."[16] Bonaventure follows Augustine's argument that *cupiditas* is at the heart of the earthly city, and he suggests that property itself becomes an occasion for the sin of *cupiditas.* "Riches are an incentive to cupidity, since it is difficult to have things and not to love them."[17] Most of the other warrants "from reason" present arguments from degree: if obedience is perfected by being most obedient, and if chastity is perfected by being completely chaste, then why would not poverty be perfected by being most poor?

One argument in particular stands out from this set, insofar as it argues for a central connection between the vows of poverty and obedience:

> Poverty is more perfect when it is accompanied by perfect obedience. But those who have property in common cannot be kept away from it by obedience if not because of some sin. Those who have nothing at all are accountable to be obedient anywhere in the world. So if the greatest evangelical perfection consists of perfect obedience, then to renounce everything universally, keeping nothing at all, makes for the peak of evangelical perfection.[18]

Bonaventure subtly advances two arguments at once here: first, and more overtly, that the evangelical counsels are interrelated, such that excellence in one requires excellence in the others. But less directly, Bonaventure is announcing the evangelical readiness of the mendicant friars to respond quickly and without reservation to pastoral needs throughout the world. If one of the arguments implied or asserted about the mendicant Orders was that they were proud and thus self-regarding in their pursuit of perfection, Bonaventure turns this argument on its head—poverty sets the friars free to be sent to a worldwide apostolate and thus to serve the church without reservation or hesitation.

---

[16] Augustine, *de civitate Dei* 14.28. See also, and perhaps more directly useful for Bonaventure's argument, Augustine, *Exposition of Psalm* 64.2, in *Expositions of the Psalms*, vol. 3, trans. Maria Boulding (Hyde Park, NY: 2001), pp. 265–66: "Two loves create the two cities: love of God creates Jerusalem; love of the world creates Babylon. All of us must therefore ask ourselves what we love, and we shall discover to which city we belong."

[17] Bonaventure, *Perf. evang.* (DPE) in *Opera Omnia* (Quarrachi), vol. 5, 117–198. This passage: "divitiae sunt incentivum cupiditatis, quia difficile est eas habere et non amare" (5, 127).

[18] Bonaventure, *Perf. evang.* (V, p. 128): Item, perfectior est paupertas, quam perfectior concomitatur obedientia; sed qui habent proprium in communi ab illo per obedientiam non possunt excludi nisi ratione peccati; qui autem nihil prorsus habent obedire tenentur ubique terrarium: si ergo perfectio evangelica maxime consistit in perfectione obedientiae, universaliter omnibus abrenuntiare, nihil prorsus reservando, ad culmen facit perfectionis evangelicae.

Some of the ten opinions *sed contra* critique the poverty of renunciation as extreme, summoning the Aristotelian maxim that "virtue consists in the mean." Beyond this critique from moderation, the objections raise the question that will become significant in later debates about poverty, whether the "money-purse" of Jesus and the Twelve (Jn. 12) demonstrates that Jesus himself had money, which would make the radical poverty of the mendicants contrary to the example of Christ. It is also proposed that the friars' radical poverty amounts to "putting God to the test" to provide for them. To the first point, Bonaventure answers that Christ had a money bag for particular times and particular situations. Quoting the *Glossa ordinaria*, Bonaventure argues that the occasion of persecution may provide fitting reason for disciples to carry a money bag in case of emergency, but this in no way diminished his command to go forth "without a purse or wallet."

Bonaventure's second article, on begging, blends the coolness of scholastic distinctions with a bit of rhetorical heat as Bonaventure begins to build his defense of this fundamental characteristic of Gospel perfection. He presents twenty arguments against considering begging to be part of Christian perfection, proceeding in the same way as in the first article, with arguments from scripture followed by arguments from the Gloss and canon law, and ending with seven arguments from reason. These are followed by thirty-seven arguments in favor of evangelical mendicancy, following the same order of argument. The scriptural warrants include the Zacchaeus story (Lk. 19) and the woman at the well (Jn. 4), and tend to equate Jesus' acceptance of, or, even more to the point, request for hospitality as begging. Such an equation illustrates an important difference between Bonaventure and William on the social role of mendicants. For Bonaventure, begging "in the name of Christ" represents a fundamental stance of receptivity to one's neighbor. In this way, he says, the mendicant "belittles and humbles himself" and "he edifies his neighbor and enkindles mercy in him." Mendicancy is a mutual relationship that redounds to the benefit of both the one who receives and the one who gives. For William and other opponents of the mendicants, begging is parasitic, not mutual. 2 Thess. 3:10, "If anyone will not work, let him not eat," is often cited and illustrates the perception of mendicancy as nothing more than freeloading. For Bonaventure, in contrast, mendicancy is undertaken for the purpose of the work of evangelical perfection in preaching and discipleship, forsaking lesser goods for greater.

Bonaventure's substantial conclusion to this article sketches this difference by separating the mendicancy of necessity, due to illness or

incapacity to work, and the mendicancy of laziness and greed, from the voluntary mendicancy of the friars, which he takes to be the "supererogation of justice," undertaken "to imitate Christ and proclaim the Gospel." Citing Augustine and John Chrysostom, Bonaventure again illustrates that the friars' mendicancy is not the refusal of social exchange as such, but rather initiates a kind of *sacrum commercium*, a sacred exchange or holy economy of preaching and mercy, gospel truth given by the mendicant, and mercy and compassion given by the donor. "Temporal goods" of sustenance are given in exchange for "spiritual goods" of the proclaimed gospel.

To this alternative economy, Bonaventure adds a theology of history in his response to the negative opinions expressed in the disputation—a dimension we will see later in the Letter to an Unknown Master. One argument advanced against mendicancy is that it is "safer and more perfect to follow the example of people who are wiser and have been found more worthy of approval" who "abandoned all their possessions in such a way that they possessed things in common." "For it is foolish," the objection continues, "that the understanding and spirit of two poor men be valued higher than the great wisdom and sublimity of (. . .) holy and learned persons."[19] To this deeply conservative objection, Bonaventure argues "that according to the disposition of divine wisdom God disposes and orders all things in their own times."[20] The gifts of the apostolic age were powerful miracles and signs, so as to overcome the challenge of idolatry. The fathers shared their gifts of deep knowledge of the scriptures and keen understanding, and thereby overcame heresy. Now, says Bonaventure, "in the last time [God] has introduced men who beg voluntarily and are poor in worldly things, so as to overcome the avarice that reigns above all at the end of the world."

For Bonaventure, providence orders gifts suited to each age's need, and he is convinced that he is living in the last age. Having said this, Bonaventure quickly hedges his text against charges of Joachite heresy. First, there is symmetry between the poverty of the apostolic church at the beginning and the mendicants at the end. Secondly, Bonaventure makes it very clear that he believes the virtues of poverty were to be found in the great saints of all ages. In this sense, then, the poverty of Francis and Dominic is not an innovation, but rather the new application of classically Christian

[19] *Perf. evang.*, q. 2. a. 2. neg. 20.
[20] *Perf. evang.*, q. 2. a. 2. resp. ad neg. 20.

virtues, applied and elevated to prominence by God's saving providence in the end of days.

It is clear that Bonaventure is no Joachite; he is careful to argue for consistency and continuity in the sacred tradition of the church. And yet we must note the clear and unabashed apocalyptic realism that frames Bonaventure's treatment of this question. He is quite sure that he is living in the last days; he is quite sure that Francis and Dominic and his followers have a singular and decisive role to play in this final act in the evangelical stance against avarice. In this frame of reference, the defense of mendicancy is more than the defense of a particular community's right to follow their vocation; it is a holy mission to resist the avaricious seduction of Antichrist and his body in preparation for the final battle.

At the end of his conclusion to art. 2, Bonaventure appends a discursive "reply to further arguments." William of Saint-Amour had circulated a series of point-by-point responses to Bonaventure's arguments based upon an unofficial transcription of Bonaventure's live disputation prior to the publication of the official redacted text.[21] Bonaventure takes the opportunity in the preparation of his final text to include his rebuttal. He answers each of William's points categorically, and then summarizes his defense of mendicancy by sketching a vision of the friars' place within the universal church, a vision that is all the more compelling against the apocalyptic frame discussed above:

> Therefore, if anyone attacks the universal renunciation of temporal things, he attacks Christ, poor, crucified (. . .). He attacks the company of apostles who say, "Behold, we have left all." He attacks the Holy Spirit, too, who inspires and suggests this to the hearts of the perfect. He even attacks God himself, the Father of all, who is the "refuge of the poor" (Ps. 9:10). Finally, he attacks the kingdom of heaven, the entire universe, whose dominion has been granted to the poor as the Lord says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." And so against such a foolish individual it is necessary that the whole world fight.[22]

But mendicancy is to be defended not simply as an icon of apostolic discipleship. Bonaventure's last argument on mendicancy has to do with the pastoral need served by mendicant Orders. If one—such as William of

---

[21] See Andrew Traver, *The Opuscula of William of St. Amour: The Minor Works of 1255–1256* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Neue Folge) 63 (Münster: 2003), 123–154. A translation of this work is included in Robert Karris' translation of the *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection*, 281–331.

[22] *Perf. evang.*, q. 2. a. 2. conc.

Saint-Amour—requires that any able-bodied man undertake "gainful and self-supporting work without exception," he thereby "impedes spiritual men [*viri spirituales*] from spiritual occupations and labors to the detriment of the salvation of souls." The common good of the church thereby suffers, "which especially consists in building up the people of Christ, in almsgiving, in teaching and guidance of souls, to which tasks God sent these newest Orders through the Supreme Pontiff and the prelates." Bonaventure has constructed an intricate and subtle web of arguments for mendicancy beginning from the traditional *loci* of scripture, tradition, and reason, but he has supplemented and enhanced these with an apocalyptic theology of history that construes the mendicant Orders as not only legitimate but also providentially and ecclesiologically crucial. God, through the Pope and the prelates, has set in motion these two Orders of "spiritual men" to minister to the church and prepare it for the last attacks of Antichrist; whoever opposes them opposes Christ; he is an antichrist.

Bonaventure's consideration of begging, in qu. 2, art. 2, is clearly the center and heart of the entire *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection.* It was only qu. 2, art. 2 that had provoked William of Saint-Amour's hasty and aggressive response, and thus only here that the dispute continued in published form. Qu. 1 sets its stage, and qu. 3, on continence, seems on the whole perfunctory and is very short. The fourth question, on obedience, serves as a final buttress to the arguments of qu. 2, art. 2 as well. The fourth question culminates in a sustained defense of obedience to the Supreme Pontiff. As we have seen above, Bonaventure concludes his arguments on mendicancy with an invocation of the authority of the Holy See to confirm and commission the friars in their apostolic work in "building up the people of Christ." In this last consideration, Bonaventure buttresses the claim with his defense of the Petrine authority of the Bishop of Rome using scriptural, patristic, canonical, and rational arguments. These arguments for mendicancy and obedience portray a centralized and united church focused upon the conversion of souls in the last days. In these inaugural disputed questions, Bonaventure not only defends the legitimacy and rights of his Minorite order, but also outlines a vision of the pastoral and evangelical mission of the Church as a whole—a mission to which the "evangelical perfection" of the Lesser Brothers is central.

A Letter in Response to Three Questions of an Unknown Master (1254–1255)[23]

The circumstances around the writing of Bonaventure's *Letter to an Unknown Master* have generated quite a bit of speculation. Whether the recipient was Roger Bacon, as Wadding and Delorme suggested, or John Pecham, as Longpre and Bougerol proposed, or some other master who will forever remain unknown, the facts as we can glean them from the manuscripts themselves are already suggestive of a dramatic tale. A young scholar, apparently English, has asked Bonaventure, then regent master in Paris, to answer three questions about the Order's Rule. This young English master, as he sought to discern his own vocation, had apparently encountered some damning criticism of the Friars Minor from a Dominican. Bonaventure responds with a very passionate defense of the Order and its way of life, marshaling many of the arguments that appear in his disputed questions and later in his *Apologia pauperum*, but here in a more irenic and less polemical mode.

The unknown master has posed three challenges. First, he notes that the rule states that "the brothers are in no way to receive money, either personally or through an intermediary" and "they shall not acquire anything as their own." He asks Bonaventure if a substantial number of friars are not in fact violating the rule in this respect, as they do appoint intermediaries and do receive at least books and other tools of study. Bonaventure responds that donations through the use of an intermediary are to be permitted if it is the role of the intermediary to spend the donors' money on goods that are then given to the brothers. In this case, it is goods, not money, that are given, and thus the sense of the Rule on this point is kept. This is so even if the intermediary is designated by the brothers themselves. Bonaventure cites Pope Gregory IX's declaration *Quo elongati*: "To those who wish to give them a [money] alms the brother may present some trustworthy person to receive it (. . .). The one thus presented by the brothers is not their agent, even though he may have been designated by them; rather, he is the agent of the person on whose authority he makes the payment, or of the one receiving it."[24] On the question

[23] Bonaventure, *Epistola de tribus quaestionibus* (VIII, pp. 331–36). English translation from *The Works of Bonaventure in Translation*, vol. 5: *Writings Concerning the Order*, trans. Dominic Monti (St. Bonaventure, NY: 1994), pp. 39–56.

[24] Bonaventure, "A Letter in Response to Three Questions of an Unknown Master," in *The Works of Bonaventure in Translation, vol. 5: Writings Concerning the Order*, trans. Dominic F. Monti, OFM (St. Bonaventure, NY: 1994), p. 45. Pope Gregory IX's decree *Quo elongati*

of books, Bonaventure invokes the rule's assertion of the friars' "right and duty of preaching" (carefully pointing out, it should be noted, that such a right or duty to preach is not found in the rule of any other community, not even the Order of Preachers, the Dominicans). Books and other tools are necessary to fulfill this duty to preach, and so the brothers may have them. This is not a contradiction, however, because the brothers are not permitted to own these books, but only to have and use them. And the same distinction between use and ownership applies equally to other forms of property, such as houses or places. Bonaventure admits that this distinction between use and dominion may create difficulties, but, relying on the truth of Francis' witness and the support of the Holy See, he leaves this question for others to sort out. "So who will be assigned the *proprietas* over these things? I reply that, whoever it does belong to, it is not mine or the Order's, and this is enough to satisfy the purity of my conscience."[25] For Bonaventure, the stakes of evangelical poverty were higher than quibbles over details of canon law.

The second challenge from the unknown master cites the rule's injunction to the brothers to engage in manual labor. The master finds many friars who do not work with their hands, and so he asks whether they are in fact violating this precept of the Rule. Bonaventure argues that this part of the rule is not a precept or even an exhortation to manual labor. Instead, he claims, Francis includes this statement as advice to those friars "to whom the Lord has given the grace of working."[26] Manual labor appears in the rule as a minimal remedy for idleness, not as a positive prescription for all the brothers. What the brothers may lack in manual labor they (hopefully) more than make up for in "hard work, both in the pursuit of truth as well as in the exercise of piety, humility, and all the other virtues."[27]

The master's last challenge follows from this previous concern. Is it appropriate for the brothers to be masters and to study philosophy? For Bonaventure, the labor of professors is a particular example of the hard work in pursuit of truth he has just commended. Bonaventure is careful to argue that Francis himself did not oppose study as such. Francis welcomed clerics (whose office requires study) into the Order, and he himself

---

has been edited by Grundmann and published in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 54 (1961). For English translation, see FA: ED 1, 570–575.

[25] Bonaventure, "Letter," 6 (Monti, 46).

[26] Francis, *Regula Bullata*, 5.1.

[27] "Letter," 9 (Monti, 50).

progressed in education even after the Order was established. Still more, Francis delighted in studying the scriptures and desired it of all the brothers, to the extent of their ability. Bonaventure relates an anecdote to prove his point: Once when Francis received a New Testament, he pulled the book apart and distributed the pages to the brothers so that all might study without conflict.

Bonaventure admits that academics are prone to pretention and ambition, and he roundly condemns all such trappings associated with the office. "I therefore condemn, as you do, any ostentation associated with the office of master, but I commend the office itself. Yes, I condemn the pretentious brother and maintain that he is entirely unworthy of the teaching office; but I praise the studious one, since I believe that the authority to teach the Gospel of Christ belongs to him more than anyone else."[28] Bonaventure includes the study of philosophy among the requirements for this pursuit of truth, "for people can hardly reap the grain without the chaff and the divine Word without the human." He distinguishes between this studious pursuit of the truth, which may range widely, from the sin of curiosity, by which many "childishly waste their time over useless writings."[29]

In this letter, Bonaventure demonstrates that the defense of mendicancy is not simply to defend this or that teaching on property and possessions. Rather, such particular questions are always interwoven with other fundamental questions of evangelical perfection. Secular objections to apostolic poverty are symptoms of a wholly different approach to the life of Christian discipleship, without which, distinctions between "owning" and "using" ring hollow. But this difference may itself be providentially ordered, according to Bonaventure. Providence has guided the Order, as it has guided the Church itself, from humble beginnings to zealous erudition in service of the truth. Bonaventure makes this clear in this oft-quoted autobiographical passage from the end of the letter:

> For I confess before God that what made me love St Francis' way of life so much was that it is exactly like the origin and the perfection of the Church itself, which began first with simple fishermen and afterwards developed to include the most illustrious and learned doctors. You find the same thing in the Order of St Francis; in this way God reveals that it did not come about through human calculations but through Christ.[30]

---

[28] "Letter," 11 (Monti, 52).
[29] "Letter," 12 (Monti, p. 52).
[30] "Letter," 13 (Monti, p. 54).

The burgeoning pastoral needs of the Church have required that Francis' fraternity of "brothers and spiritual men" rise to meet them through teaching and preaching, and they must not refuse to meet these needs. "For who are better fit to teach the Gospel than those who profess and observe it?"[31]

The Apologia Pauperum, 1269

The controversy with the secular masters seemed to sputter for a decade or so after the inception of Bonaventure and Thomas into the faculty of the University of Paris. It seems, however, that Gerard of Abbeville, one of the most talented and distinguished secular masters, simply may have been holding back his response until the dust settled from the papal intervention. One of Bonaventure's fellow friars, probably Thomas of York, had written a response to William of Saint-Amour in the first round of the poverty controversy around 1256, entitled *Manus quae*. It seems likely that Gerard composed a rebuttal, *Contra adversarium*,[32] soon thereafter, but held it back for publication until 1269, perhaps exploiting the confusion around the prolonged papal conclave after the death of Clement IV. Papal decisions had generally favored the positions of the friars; the absence of a pope must have struck Gerard as an opportune moment. Gerard's *Contra adversarium* makes two incisive critiques of the defense of mendicancy. First, Gerard musters a significant exegetical argument that demonstrates Christ and the apostles' apparent possession of money and ownership of goods. For example, in Jn. 4, Jesus is left alone with the woman at the well in Samaria because the apostles have gone off to buy some bread, which suggests that they had money with which to buy it. This and other scriptural loci present some rather compelling evidence about Jesus' own practice that cut against the grain of Minorite arguments about Christian perfection. Secondly, Gerard explored the ramifications in legal theory of splitting dominion and use, two notions which in earlier law had been fundamentally and integrally related:

> To say that the use of them alone is yours, and that the dominion pertains to those who have given them, until they are consumed by age, or until the food is taken into the stomach, will appear ridiculous to all, above all

[31] "Letter," 11 (Monti, p. 51)

[32] See S. Clasen, "Tractatus Gerardi de Abbatisvilla 'Contra adversarium perfectionis Christianae,'" *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 31 (1938): 277–83.

> since use is not distinguished from dominion among men in things that are utterly consumed by use.[33]

In traditional property law, dominion and use were joined precisely because dominion made no sense if there was no material benefit to the owner. Having property was related integrally to using it well, and its use was for the benefit of the owner. To separate these two was to rend the integral sense of the good of property itself, making it an abstract quality.

Bonaventure's response in the *Apologia pauperum* is less a point-by-point rebuttal of Gerard's charges than a trenchant analysis of what is at stake in the mendicant controversy as such. This broader scope is perhaps the reason why Bonaventure's account of mendicancy was so influential, as it was more or less completely taken over by the bull of Pope Nicholas III, *Exiit qui seminat*, promulgated in 1279, setting the terms for the later poverty controversy under Pope John XXII.[34]

Bonaventure begins the *Apologia* with a brief survey of the history of the controversy, from William of Saint-Amour to Thomas of York to Gerard, effectively broadening the discussion from particular points of exegesis and law to a more considered reflection on the Church and the Christian life. As in his disputed questions a decade earlier, Bonaventure centers his argument on the nature of Christian perfection. For Bonaventure, attacks on evangelical perfection can be reduced to four fundamental forms of assault: First, his enemies aim to "topple the heights of evangelical perfection." That is, Gerard and William challenge Christ's exemplary model of Christian perfection itself. Secondly, they try to "demolish its defenses" by attacking the very forms of Christian perfection found in the tradition: martyrdom, abstinence, and fasting. Thirdly, enemies lay siege to the "foundations of perfection" in the practice of poverty. Lastly, these enemies attack the mendicants themselves.

By casting the controversy in these terms, Bonaventure has illuminated the roots of the controversy in fundamental theological questions: What was God doing in Christ to reconcile the world to himself? And so how is the Church called to respond to this work of reconciliation? In other words, beneath the question whether dominion can be separated from use, and before the practice and character of the mendicant Orders can

---

[33] S. Clasen, "Tractatus Gerardi de Abbatisvilla," 279.

[34] On the relationship between Bonaventure's defense of mendicancy and *Exiit qui seminat*, and for later developments in the debate over poverty, see Malcolm D. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order, 1210–1323* (London: 1961, rev. ed. St. Bonaventure, NY: 1998).

be evaluated, central questions of Christology and ecclesiology have to be addressed explicitly. The effect of the *Apologia* is to lift these theological questions to the fore, making the particular defense of the Minorites a matter of following out the theological claims to their conclusion. And so the *Apologia pauperum* is itself a rhetorical redoubt, an edifice of theological argument to defend evangelical perfection. Demonstrating his knowledge of basic battlefield strategy, Bonaventure defends evangelical perfection from the "fourfold assault" listed above with "a fourfold reply (…) as four lines of defense, and each line must have three sides (…) so that the soldiers of God, surrounded by these triangular fortifications, may remain invulnerable and protected against the sharp points of flaming darts."[35]

To defend against the first volley, which aims to "topple the heights of evangelical perfection," Bonaventure argues that Gerard's arguments against the mendicants' high standard of "evangelical perfection" amount to little more than a "perverse and bitter fanaticism" in defense of mediocrity. Gerard had argued that Christ's actions on earth must, by definition, be perfect, and thus set the standard of human perfection. If this is so, then all of the texts he had amassed that illustrate or assume that Christ and the apostles worked with money would, *ipso facto*, discredit the mendicants' arguments that poverty is a perfection.

Bonaventure attacks this argument at its Christological root. If Gerard is correct, then the category of divine condescension to humans broken and weakened by sin is nonsensical. But to make such a claim is to defy the clear sense of the fathers. Bonaventure, like David against Goliath, selects "five smooth stones" from the tradition—Augustine, Ambrose, John Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, and Hugh of St. Victor (whom Bonaventure names the "final Catholic doctor")—to strike Gerard on the forehead with arguments about Christ's condescension. Hugh, for example, notes that Jesus had a purse, "conforming himself to the imperfect," but Paul did not, "thus Paul seems to have done something greater than Christ."

> But Christ wished to be numbered among the imperfect lest those who took nothing fall into presumption, lest those who accepted gifts be confounded, and lest a man who did what Christ refused be suspected of not being a Christian.

[35] *Apol. paup.*, prol. 3.

For Hugh, and so for Bonaventure, Christ's acceptance of the purse is a hortatory and pedagogical practice, to extend compassion to the weak and, at the same time, to protect against their own pride those who are strong enough to live in poverty. Implicitly, then, Christ is validating those who live without a purse by teaching them how they should live in this way, i.e., without presumption.

Bonaventure follows these arguments from authority with a series of arguments from reason. As we have seen, Gerard's treatise musters a series of scriptural citations to show that Christ and the apostles held a purse, that Christ fled persecution, and so on. Bonaventure's response moves from finer points of logic to the heights of Christology, but in essence he argues that Gerard and his ilk have flattened out the life of Christ and blurred its edges. Opponents of mendicancy level all the actions of Christ and then, because these are Christ's actions, declare them "perfect" *ipso facto*. To fail to do so, they argue, would be to accuse Christ of imperfection, and thus of evil. The logical mistake is to assume, as Gerard does, that perfection and imperfection "differ as do rectitude and distortion, justice and sin, purity and pollution, glory and infamy, life and death, health and disease, or walking and limping."[36] But, says Bonaventure, "perfection and imperfection do not differ as contraries but as a greater good is distinct from a lesser one (. . .), a more meritorious action from one of lesser merit, a deed better conformed to God from one less so."[37] Imperfection is not itself sin, as Gerard seems to assume.

To rebut this claim, Bonaventure develops a nuanced and articulated set of distinctions which prepare the ground for a larger Christological claim. Things, he says, may be "good" or "evil" in three different ways, and so they may be "perfect" or "imperfect" in the same ways. Things may be good or evil, perfect or imperfect (1) by nature; (2) according to circumstance; or (3) in themselves. Things that are good by nature are a "transient act related to a proper matter," like attending church or giving to the poor. Things are good according to circumstances when, say, one gives alms in the right time, in the right place, and in the right proportion. Acts good by nature or circumstance can be distorted by a distorted intention, i.e., if one attends church in order to be praised for his piety. This possibility of distortion distinguishes these two kinds of acts from things

[36] *Apol. paup.*, 2.14.
[37] *Apol. paup.*, 2.14.

good in themselves, which can never be made evil, as in "an act of virtue proceeding from the root of love."

In a similar way, acts may be perfect or imperfect (1) by nature, (2) according to circumstance, or (3) in themselves. Acts perfect in themselves are "both difficult and excellent," like entering religious life. Acts perfect through circumstances are difficult and "adorned with favorable conditions," such as an act that conduces to the edification of one's neighbor. Acts perfect in themselves are difficult and proceed from charity. Love of one's enemies, for example, is an act perfect in itself. Acts imperfect by nature are those to which human weakness is inclined, like the fear of death or the possession of wealth. Acts may be perfect by nature but made imperfect by circumstances, such as giving all one's wealth under threat of death. Acts imperfect in themselves would include things like divorce or "fleeing poverty."

This heuristic grid of perfection and imperfection provides an interpretive key to the acts of Christ that Gerard has used as evidence. Bonaventure distinguishes between Christ's interior works, which produce effects, and his exterior works, that is, the effects or external acts that are produced. Every interior act of Christ is perfect because he always intends the highest good for all, with perfection of will and understanding. But his external works, the observable acts that result from his perfect intention, are sometimes perfect by nature, as when he offers himself for our sakes, and sometimes imperfect by nature, as when he fled persecution or prayed that his cup may pass in Gethsemane. Nevertheless, these acts that are imperfect by nature are made perfect by circumstance, that is, by the "love, reason, and purpose for which he did these things."

Bonaventure has done all this work to deepen his defense of divine condescension, such that it is now defended by authority and reason:

> And so it is true that all the works of Christ are perfect in relation to Himself. It is also true that Christ performed some deeds that consisted in assuming the person of the weak and in condescending to our frailties and imperfections. Further, it is again true that the opposite of such things may be done with merit. In light of certain circumstances of time and place, it may even be better to do the opposite. Yet finally, it is true that in such cases the disciple never becomes greater than his Master.[38]

All the actions of Christ are the work of God's Word for the good of salvation. In this way, they are perfect, the exemplar of God's salvific will in

[38] *Apol. paup.*, 1.11.

human flesh. Divine condescension toward human weakness represents one "tactic" within this overall divine "strategy." Because the strategy is perfect, the act is made perfect, but need not therefore be imitated. Without the conditions of the divine sovereign salvific will, such actions could not in themselves be made good or perfect.

This heuristic device will illuminate some of the details in Bonaventure's wider Christology, which becomes central to his larger argument about evangelical perfection as such. "Since Christ is the Word both Uncreated and Incarnate, there is in Him a twofold principle of exemplarity." In his eternal exemplarity, the Word represents and manifests the glory of the Father, the "intellectual Mirror and the eternal Exemplar of the whole fabric of creation," issuing forth in the great variety of created natures and perfections within those natures, "that all cannot be possessed together by any given creature." In like fashion, as Incarnate Word, Christ is the "mirror of all graces, virtues, and merits." That is, the fullness of human perfections, in all degrees and specifications, is contained and represented in him and flows through him. All the "states, levels, and orders" of the faithful manifest the various distribution of the gifts and "within them, the manifold perfection of Christ is distributed according to a multiform participation." The Incarnate Word, Jesus of Nazareth, contains within himself the fullness and variety of gifts and perfections of the Body of Christ, the church, not in some ideal fashion, but, in some measure, in the many and various concrete actions of his life. On this reading, *sub specie Dei*, Jesus must make manifest the variety of degrees of perfection in his life precisely because of who he is, the Divine Exemplar. This variety and multiplicity show that divine condescension is not in tension with, but rather is fully harmonious with the fullness of divine perfection.

Bonaventure proceeds to categorize the actions of Christ in six ways, pertaining to (1) *the loftiness of power* (miraculous acts like walking on water); (2) *the light of wisdom* (predicting the future, penetrating the secrets of the heart), (3) *the severity of judgment* (cleansing the temple). (4) *the dignity of office* (forgiving sins, conferring his eucharistic body), (5) *the condescension toward our misery* (hiding from persecution, etc.); and (6) *the revelation of the perfect life* (poverty, chastity, obedience, prayer, forgiveness, self-sacrifice). Only this last category of action is offered for perfection in imitation. This set of distinctions answers Gerard's arguments about the practice of Christ and the apostles. To say that Christ acted in such and such a way is not sufficient to recommend that action to disciples; one must always ask what sort of action this was and with what intent. Consequently, Bonaventure can argue that the call to evangelical

perfection is not issued universally, but particularly, to a certain "state, level, or order" of the Body of Christ. If not all are called to that kind of perfection, this is no defect in the divine call, but rather evidence of the abundant fullness of every good and perfect gift descending from the Father of lights. We can see here that the argument about evangelical perfection is in fact an argument about the nature of the Church. Bonaventure envisions a unified but differentiated hierarchy, a reflection of the ordered cosmos. It is a deeply Pseudo-Dionysian vision, wherein perfection is found in a hierarchy of being, and in which the Church echoes the order of the cosmos itself.[39] Bonaventure will develop this ecclesiastical hierarchy in greater detail in the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, but for now it is important to see that the *Apologia pauperum* is more than a partisan defense of Bonaventure's fellow Minorites; it is an argument in defense of a comprehensive theological and ecclesiological vision.

It is upon this vision that Bonaventure builds the rest of his argument. His "second line of defense" defends traditional acts of Christian perfection that Gerard had attacked—martyrdom, fasting, and abstinence—through the application of the lines of argument of the first part. That is, he begins with arguments from authority and proceeds to arguments from reason. For example, where Gerard of Abbeville had mustered numerous traditional texts that showed saints and holy men fleeing martyrdom, Bonaventure first summons the clear scriptural testimony of St. Paul, and then constructs an argument about the proper roots of martyrdom in love. The deep rationale for martyrdom is the perfection of love, and Christ's flight from martyrdom represents a naturally imperfect act made perfect by Christ's condescending love. In like fashion, Bonaventure defends abstinence and fasting as habits essential to the support of evangelical perfection and as practices that in no way entail disdain for the goodness of creation, as Gerard has accused. Each of these arguments depends upon Bonaventure's careful parsing of the senses of perfection and imperfection, and each continues to advance the argument about God's divine and merciful condescension in Christ.

When Bonaventure turns next to discuss poverty itself, however, his argument deepens. Poverty for Bonaventure is not a habit or practice that contributes to evangelical perfection; it is the foundation of evangelical

---

[39] Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *The Complete Works*, trans. Colm Luibheid (Mahwah: 1987). See especially the "Celestial Hierarchy" and the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy." For the intimate relation between these, see Andrew Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, (New York: 2002).

poverty itself. Invoking St. Augustine's image of the "two cities," Bonaventure contrasts the City of God, "rooted and grounded in love," (Eph. 3:17) with Babylon, built upon *cupiditas*, "disordered desire" or covetousness, which is "the root of all evils" (1 Tim. 6:10). Christ, in his life and teachings, "embraced with great eagerness the very opposite of such covetousness, advocating poverty by his example and preaching it by his word."[40] Bonaventure argues that *cupiditas* must be rooted out, both in the "disposition of the mind" and in the external material occasions for sin, and "poverty of spirit" is the name for this twofold discipline. Poverty of spirit, he says, is thus the root and foundation of any and all evangelical perfection.

With this foundation in mind, Bonaventure then begins to define evangelical poverty itself. If possession of temporal goods consists in both ownership and use, and if use of temporal goods is necessary in the present life, then evangelical poverty "consists in renouncing the dominion and right to earthly possessions (. . .); [it is] the virtue of abdicating temporal goods, such that someone, having nothing for himself, is sustained by what is not his own." One might note that such a definition does not exclude communal ownership of goods, such as the Rule of Augustine or the Rule of Benedict indicates, and Bonaventure does not intend it to. There are, he argues, two degrees of perfection in evangelical poverty. The first degree involves individual poverty and communal ownership, as above, and as illustrated in the apostolic community in Acts 4:32ff: "The community of believers was united, heart and soul; no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, as everything they owned was held in common" (NJB). The summit of perfection is a higher calling to evangelical poverty, and this is chosen by the mendicants and depicted in the apostolic mission: "Jesus sent out the twelve, instructing them as follows: "As you go, proclaim that the kingdom of heaven is at hand (. . .). Provide yourselves with no gold or silver, not even with coppers for your purses, with no haversack for the journey or spare tunic or footwear or a staff" (Mt. 10:5,7,9–10, NJB). Bonaventure summons abundant testimony from the fathers to support this passage as a summons to a form of evangelical perfection particularly suited to those called to proclaim the Gospel. He quotes the *Glossa ordinaria* on the verse of Matthew to this effect: "[Christ] virtually cuts away the things necessary for life, lest those who teach that everything is governed by God be concerned with tomorrow.

[40] *Apol. paup.*, 7.2.

And so they take with them not even the necessities—no supply of food; nothing, not even the slightest thing, but the clothes they wear."[41] This radical evangelical poverty is thus a kind of performative theology, a way for preachers of the reign of God to embody and practice radical trust in God's providential rule.

Bonaventure once again develops an understanding of evangelical poverty as a particular calling within the wider hierarchical array of callings to holiness within the church. If the mendicant's evangelical poverty is a perfection, this fact does not make all lesser virtues into vices. Indeed, evangelical poverty with communal possession remains a form of perfection, slightly lower than the "summit of perfection" in mendicant poverty, but not therefore imperfect. Similarly, this calling for mendicants does not make possessions themselves wicked; rather they are compatible with a good life. "Wealth offers no difficult obstacle to those who desire to enter the kingdom of God, except by being an occasion of propensity toward evil or of distraction from good." Since the good (but imperfect) have only to "avoid major sins through the observance of the commandments," wealth does not violate any command intrinsically. Indeed, Bonaventure allows even that one committed to a life of perfection may still handle the management of temporal goods "without damage to their perfection." But this is quite different from saying, as Gerard does, that therefore possessions are part of the life of perfection. Bonaventure argues that, insofar as they are perfect, these persons are so not *through* the possession of material goods, but *in spite of* this, that is, through their contempt for their possessions and their willingness to put them to the good use of the church.[42]

Gerard of Abbeville argued that the Levitical priesthood among the people Israel represented a form of perfection that included the possession of wealth and property. He argued that the scriptures advocating renunciation of goods were an *ad hoc* remedy to a particular problem, namely, attachment to wealth. Once this attachment was rooted out, one was free to possess property perfectly, without covetousness. For Bonaventure, such an account entails a shallow understanding of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments, a naive estimation of the effects of property, and a confused understanding of perfection. If the Levitical priesthood had a kind of perfection, it was a limited perfection intended

---

[41] *Apol. paup*., 7.5: Propemodum necessaria vitae amputata, ne vel current de crastino qui docent, omnia regi a Deo, nec ipsa necessaria nec cellarium secum vehant, nihil praeter vestimentum, nec etiam minima (my translation). Cf. *Glossa ordinaria*, in Mattheum.

[42] *Apol. paup.* 8.21f.

to anticipate and figure the future perfection fulfilled in Christ and the church. Further, Bonaventure believes that property can be kept without sin, but he also holds that the private ownership of property presents the owner with a persistent and present occasion of sin. On the last point, Bonaventure returns to his critique of Gerard's understanding of perfection itself. The ratio (perfect-imperfect) is wholly other than the ratio (good-wicked). There are many forms of imperfection that are still good. Gerard insists on flattening out the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and thus he does violence to the rich and abundant diversity of divine gifts.

To summarize and extend his argument about evangelical poverty thus far, Bonaventure describes how the particular gift of evangelical poverty serves the church in four ways, each of which Bonaventure divides into three. First, *poverty destroys iniquity*. As a cleansing furnace, poverty burns away the detritus acquired by past sins. It also destroys iniquity by removing occasions for sin and cuts out the root of vice. Secondly, *poverty is an exercise of perfect virtue*, insofar as it tests virtues, preserves them, and helps them develop toward their proper end. Thirdly, *poverty aids in the fruition of interior joy.* This it does first, and perhaps paradoxically, by providing external security. By having nothing, the mendicant frees himself from worry over the protection of his things in this life and secures for himself a place in life everlasting. Poverty brings inner joy to fruition through the attendant gift of superinfused consolation, as well. Finally, *poverty is useful in spreading the teaching of the gospel*. Poverty lends credibility to preachers. It makes their teaching more effective and thus more acceptable, "leading the listeners to faith, raising them in hope, and drawing them to love." These 12 (4×3) gifts of poverty extend the argument Bonaventure has drawn from the gloss above: evangelical poverty is an embodied theology of discipleship, a mystical *itinerarium* moving the mendicant from purgation to illumination to contemplation and, finally, to evangelical action.[43]

It is only after all this exegetical, dialectical, and theological work has been done that Bonaventure at last turns to the particular accusations brought against the mendicant Orders. It is important to note that, from Bonaventure's point of view, he is simply defending a matter settled already by papal decree; if Gerard hopes to exploit contemporary confusion in

[43] To borrow the Dominican motto, Bonaventure has given a four-stage itinerary for "contemplare et contemplata aliis tradere," "to contemplate and pass on to others what has been contemplated."

the papal court to regain some ground against the mendicants, Bonaventure stands in the breach to hold the line set by Pope Gregory IX in the papal bull *Quo elongati* (1230) and by his successor Innocent IV in the bull *Ordinem vestrum* (1245). This line included the clear distinction between *dominion* (*dominium* or *proprietas*, ownership) over property and its *use* (*usus*), allowing the friars to refuse dominion of goods while retaining the right to make simple use of them. For Bonaventure, *Ordinem vestrum* had made it a matter of settled law that dominion of any property given to the friars was held by the papacy, while the friars could make simple use of it. To Gerard, such a distinction defied all legal logic. In civil law, dominion is always and necessarily attached to "usufruct," that is, the right to enjoy the benefits or fruits of property. In the case of consumable goods such as food eaten by the friars, how could it be that the usufruct of the food remained with the Pope while the food was consumed by the friars?

Bonaventure's response, while framed in terms of civil law, argues against a too-shallow understanding of the goods pursued by law. In essence, Bonaventure reduces law into theology, educing a spiritual good from material evangelical poverty:

> If perchance someone tries to oppose [our] reasoning by claiming that there is a warning in civil law that use cannot be separated perpetually from dominion, we will answer that this principle of civil law has no application here, since the law pronounces such a decree lest dominion become useless, and hence be nothing but an empty word. Now, to retain this kind of dominion over things while the use of them is conceded to the poor is not fruitless, since it may be of merit to the father of the poor and of use for the profession of the sons serving Christ.[44]

Bonaventure insists that the spiritual fruits of the mendicants' work are indeed real fruits, not to be separated from material goods. One might argue, in fact, that this is what the mendicant mission does. it converts material goods into spiritual goods. If this fractures all precedent in civil law, says Bonaventure, it is within the rightful authority of the pope to do so. "Although from the viewpoint of civil law use and dominion as regards any object may be considered as one, the pontifical authority may

[44] *Apol. paup.*, 11.7: Quodsi forte his quisquam conetur obsistere, ex eo quod iure cautum est, usum non posse perpetuo a dominio separari; respondebimus, quod lex illa civilis non habet hic locum, quia hoc ideo ius civile decrevit, ne dominium inutile videatur ac per hoc inanis sit nominis. Nam retentio dominii huiusmodi rerum com concessione usus facta pauperibus non est infructuosa, cum sit patri pauperum meritoria et professioni filiorum Christo famulantium opportune (my translation).

decree that in certain persons they are separate. And with the power of his authority, the Vicar of Christ has in fact decreed that this was the case with the Order of the said friars, and to go against such a decision is never permitted."[45]

For Bonaventure, since spiritual authority is higher than temporal, papal authority, with a view to the spiritual benefits of the life and mission of the friars, can overrule temporal or civil law, and indeed has done so. He demonstrates that the friars have the authority of papal precedent on their side, and he calls upon the church to rise up and defend them. "It is upon you, O Most Holy Roman Church (…) that the mass of the mendicants now call in trust, so that those you have born as a mother and have raised as a nurse, you may now defend as a queen, powerfully and justly."[46] Appealing still higher, Bonaventure implores the intercession of the Blessed Mother Mary, "defender of the poor and advocate of the humble." In so doing, Bonaventure subsumes a lawyerly argument over the nature of property into an invocation and a prayer. Bonaventure is here doing more than a rhetorical sleight of hand; he is pushing the argument to its radical implications. To attack the legitimacy of the mission and nature of the friars minor, whether through physical persecution or through legal technicalities, is to stand against the holy church. Once again, Bonaventure insists that the mendicant controversy is, at its root, a battle for the evangelical mission of the church itself.

The twelfth and last book of the *Apologia pauperum*, following this grand climactic call to arms and petition, is devoted to clearing up the particular objections to the life of the friars, versions of which we have seen raised in Bonaventure's earlier debates. Gerard "smears the life of the Mendicants" by pointing to their lack of manual labor, their renunciation of property, and their begging. Bonaventure's response begins with a sevenfold typology of the work of the priestly office. A priest is called "to lead back to God those under his authority by means of a sevenfold hierarchical action. He is therefore a builder, a gardener, a shepherd, a trustee, a physician, a watchman, and a leader." By introducing this typology before he begins to defend mendicant practices, he establishes a pastoral index, a proper measure by which the work of the friars is to be evaluated. Once

[45] *Apol. paup.*, 11.10.

[46] *Apol. paup.*, 11.16: Te igitur sacrosancta romana Ecclesia,… fiducialiter interpellat tuorum pauperum coetus, ut quos genuisti ut mater, educasti ut nutrix, nunc etiam ut regina potenter ac iuste defendas.

again, Bonaventure establishes that the Minorite poverty is evangelical—it is always at the service of the church's pastoral mission.

It is precisely this pastoral mission that justifies the friar's refraining from manual labor and receiving material support from others. With careful readings of Augustine, Ambrose, and Anselm, Bonaventure argues that "four categories of men justly and worthily deserve to be supported by others." Those who preach or teach, who say mass, who bring the sacraments to the faithful, or who give their possessions away to the poor, according to the authority of the fathers, are doing good spiritual work and thus justly receive the support of the church in their work. If this seems to exclude the life of study, Bonaventure argues that study is preparatory for these other kinds of work and is in its own way arduous.

In a similar vein, Bonaventure demonstrates that the mendicants' renunciation of property is in service of the preaching and teaching of the Gospel. Far from showing contempt for themselves or for the goods of the created order, mendicants entrust themselves to God's providence as they set about the work of the Gospel. Their renunciation of goods is not diffidence, then, but confidence in God's care. "It is thus that, for over sixty years," says Bonaventure, "these poor have lived in great numbers, while God's action appeared so clearly in them, and his promise was fulfilled so well."[47] And so the mendicant practice of begging, instrumental to this way of life that has seen such success, is similarly justified. Far from the kind of begging that comes as a result of avarice or sloth, the practice of mendicant friars is born of righteousness and so brings with it spiritual consolations consonant with virtue.

Gerard's last critique of poverty, and the one Bonaventure leaves to the very end of his *Apology*, is that the begging of the mendicants takes food and goods out of the hands of the involuntary poor. By implication, then, mendicants are thieves and murderers, stealing sustenance from those truly in need and thus depriving them of the necessities of life.[48] Such an accusation fails to acknowledge that, in order to become friars, these men have already given all of their material goods to the poor, and now, as priests, preachers, teachers, and servants, they continue to give spiritual

---

[47] *Apol. paup.*, 12.22: His enim modis vixerunt hactenus huiusmodi pauperes in magna multitudine sexaginta annis et amplius, per operis exhibitionem adeo in eis divino impleto promisso . . .

[48] This allegation against Francis and Franciscan poverty has been raised in recent years in Kenneth Baxter Wolf, *The Poverty of Riches: St. Francis of Assisi Reconsidered* (New York: 2003).

goods in abundance. Further, by their visible witness to the poor through their begging, the friars encourage the faithful to works of mercy. But Bonaventure is careful to note, in the closing paragraphs of the *Apology*, that mendicancy is not for everyone. "We have said these things not to commend an unrestricted multiplication of mendicants, nor that we wish to commend every form of mendicancy as perfect—no, only insofar as it is annexed to the study of that sevenfold wisdom [of the priestly office]."[49] Bonaventure's defense of the friars argues only for their particular place within a diverse and hierarchically-differentiated order, as instruments of salvation in the church's divine mission.

Conclusion: A Mendicant Theology

As we have seen above, Bonaventure's consistent practice in his defense of mendicancy is to "reduce"[50] the questions to their theological foundations. Claims about evangelical perfection, use and dominion, or begging are always related in the deep structure of Bonaventure's argument to claims about Christ and the Church. But these theological reductions are not simply *ad hoc* responses to accusations; they lie at the heart of Bonaventure's theological vision itself.[51] Bonaventure perceives creation as the overflowing and outpouring of existence *ex nihilo*, out of nothing. In other words, everything that is exists only as complete and utterly gratuitous gift; existence itself is sustained in being by divine generosity. In this sense, creation itself is mendicant. All creation is dependent upon the "alms," the good and perfect gift, of the Father of lights (Jas. 1:17), in what we might call a *natural* or *ontological mendicancy*.

Further, human beings, already utterly dependent in their nature as creatures, depend even more upon divine grace because of their sinful condition. Always in need of divine grace, humans are thus *existentially mendicant* as well. Given this double mendicancy, it is fitting that

---

[49] *Apol. paup.*, 7.41: Haec idcirco diximus, non quia commendemus effrenatam mendicantium multitudinem, aut omnem mendicandi modum ut perfectum approbare velimus; sed eum dumtaxat, qui annexum habet studium sapientiae septiforme.

[50] "Reduction," of course, in Bonaventure's particular sense of the term, as leading a phenomenon back to its true root and source.

[51] See Zachary Hayes, OFM, *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure* (Mahwah, NJ: 1981; reprinted, St. Bonaventure, NY: 1992). See ch. 6: "Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Poverty Controversy," for a similar (and more extensive) discussion of the relationship of mendicancy to Bonaventure's fundamental theology.

Bonaventure's *Itinerarium* comes to us with the caption, "Here begins the speculation of a poor man in the desert." Insofar as the *Itinerarium* is an illustration of the way all things—the exterior world, the interior soul both created and redeemed, and the divine names above—bear witness to God as their source and their end, it illustrates this double mendicancy. With all this in mind, one can see that the mendicant vocation is a kind of performative theology, a living witness, undertaken in freedom, to the very dependencies that constitute us as creatures made in the image and likeness of God and redeemed by his Word.[52]

Further, mendicancy describes not only our condition, but also the form of the divine remedy. When the divine Word condescends to meet humanity in its brokenness, the Incarnation of Christ manifests God's love by arriving in a stable in Bethlehem, living an itinerant life "with no place to lay his head," and dying naked among criminals. The life of Jesus offers an *exemplum* of evangelical perfection precisely as a model of complete self-dispossessive love, the image of divine love in a created world broken by sin. The call of mendicants to live in imitation of Christ is thus an echo or extension of the divine mission of salvation. It is a vital element of the mission of the Church.

Bonaventure was as willing to apply this pastoral theology of mendicancy as an internal critique of his brethren as he was to use it in defense against external attack. We have pointed to the work of David Burr, who shows how Bonaventure's exhortations to his friars consistently chide them for laxity and encourage them to a more rigorous observance of the Rule. Such exhortations have a theological root as well. In Bonaventure's later work, especially in his last, the *Collations on the Six Days of Creation*, he sketches a historical and theological vision in which Francis and the mendicants play a crucial role in bringing the pastoral mission of the Church to fruition. In this work, the six days of creation stand for, among other things, six ages of history, seen in the Old Testament first and recapitulated and completed in the New. Nearly twenty years after the Joachite controversy around John of Parma and Gerard of Borgo San Donino has passed, Bonaventure feels free to invoke a mitigated Joachimist theology of history.[53] For Bonaventure, the sixth age of history is afflicted by "the

---

[52] Indeed, one is tempted to say that, like Hans Urs von Balthasar's famous call for a "theology that kneels," we find in Bonaventure a "theology that begs."

[53] For further discussion of this dimension in Bonaventure's thought, see Bernard McGinn, "The Abbot and the Doctors: Scholastic Reactions to the Radical Eschatology of Joachim of Fiore," *Church History* 40 (1971): 30–47 and, more recently, Kevin L. Hughes,

wickedness of thieves," with the sins of greed and avarice infecting the church. It is in this time, then, that the mendicant Orders arrive, heralded by Francis, the "angel of the sixth seal" of the Apocalypse, "who ascends from the sunrise bearing the seal of the living God,"[54] calling the church to simplicity and contemplation, so that the church may itself become the eschatological *ecclesia contemplativa*, the contemplative church that heralds the Heavenly Jerusalem. "Contemplation," he says, "cannot come about except in the greatest simplicity, and the greatest simplicity cannot exist except in the greatest poverty. And this is proper to the Order. The intention of Blessed Francis was to live in the greatest poverty." However, says Bonaventure, the order has fallen away from this state of poverty. Its persecution is due in part to its laxity. "[Bonaventure] said that we had receded a lot from our status, and thus God permitted that we be afflicted, so that (…) we may be led back to our status and possess the promised land."[55]

Bonaventure's defense of mendicancy, then, admits of its own reduction. He believed the mendicant orders were not only legal and legitimate, but providential and eschatological in significance. To protect his community, he built his arguments *ad extra* on law and scholastic distinctions, but the dynamic motivation behind these technical arguments was to prepare the way of the Lord as the world's end approached, and he did not refrain from reminding his brothers of what was at stake. Their witness to the gratuitous gift of God in the mysteries of creation and redemption was to be instrumental in hastening the dawn of a new contemplative era in the life of the Church. True, evangelical perfection was not required of all the faithful, but its role in the sanctification of all was of ultimate significance. The paradox of mendicancy is plain: for Bonaventure, the mighty deeds of God in the world were intimately connected to the simple and poor life of a community of the faithful seeking only to be *nudus nudum Christum sequens*, "naked following the naked Christ." For Bonaventure, this was a paradox worth defending.

"Eschatological Union: The Mystical Dimension of History in Joachim of Fiore, Bonaventure, and Peter Olivi," *Collectanea Franciscana* 72 (2002): 105–143.

[54] Bonaventure, *Legenda maior*, prol. 1, trans. FA:ED 2, p. 527.

[55] *Hex.*, 20.30: Contemplatio non potest esse nisi in summa simplicitate; et summa simplicitas non potest esse nisi in maxima paupertate; et haec est huius ordinis. Intentio beati Francisci fuit esse in summa paupertate—Et dicebat, quoniam multum retrocessimus a statu nostro, et ideo permittit nos Deus affligi, ut per hoc reducamur ad statum, qui debet habere terram promissionis.

BONAVENTURE AS MINISTER GENERAL

Dominic V. Monti

On 2 February 1257, at a chapter of the Order of Friars Minor held in Rome, Bonaventure of Bagnoregio was unanimously elected its minister general. This was at the suggestion of his predecessor, John of Parma. Bonaventure would then not hand over the reins of government until June 1274, at a chapter held in conjunction with the Second Council of Lyons. In the interim, he had presided over five other general chapters, which had endorsed his leadership and renewed his mandate. His seventeen-year term of office was far longer than any of his predecessors or any of his successors for more than a century. It was not simply the sheer length of Bonaventure's tenure, however, that made it significant: it was the fact that it occurred at a critical juncture in Franciscan history, as the Lesser Brothers were struggling to formulate a clear self-understanding of their role in church and society.[1] As minister general, Bonaventure played a truly singular role in this process: his policies and writings did much to define an identity for his brotherhood that would stamp it decisively for generations.[2]

---

[1] For a general introduction to and translation of Bonaventure's writings as general minister, see Dominic V. Monti, *Writings Concerning the Franciscan Order* (Works of St Bonaventure) 5 (Saint Bonaventure: 1994), and *Opuscoli Francescani*, intro. Luigi Pellegrini (Opere di San Bonaventura) 1 (Rome: 1993). Treatments in general histories of the Order include John Moorman, *A History of The Franciscan Order: from its Origins to the Year 1517* (Oxford: 1968), 140–155; Grado Giovanni Merlo, *In the Name of St Francis*, trans. Raphael Bonnano (Saint Bonaventure: 2009), 200–220; Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Rochester, Eng.: 2006), 82–94; and the older but still valuable treatment of Gratien de Paris, *Histoire de la fondation et de l'évolution de l'Ordre des frères mineurs au XIII^e siècle*, reprint of 1928 edition with updated bibliography by Mariano D'Alatri and Servus Gieben (Rome: 1982), 249–320. Also see the studies by Rosalind Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government* (Cambridge, Eng.: 1959), 247–285, and "St. Bonaventure as Minister General," *S. Bonaventura francescano* (Convegni di Studi sulla spiritualità medievale) 14 (Todi: 1974), 77–105; Raoul Manselli, "St. Bonaventure and the Clericalization of the Friars Minor," *Greyfriars Review* 4 (1990): 83–98; and Giovanni Odoardi, "L'evoluzione istituzionale dell'Ordine codificata e difesa da San Bonaventura," *Miscellanea Francescana* 75 (1975): 137–185.

[2] See the important study by Roberto Lambertini, *Apologia e crescita dell'identità francescana (1255–1279)* (Nuovi Studi Storici) 4 (Rome 1990).

When Francis of Assisi and his first companions approached Pope Innocent III for approval of their way of life in 1209, they were a band of laymen from various social strata, who had been motivated to "do penance" by rejecting the quest for status, wealth, and power that increasingly dominated the life of the rising communes of central Italy.[3] Instead, they had renounced all their possessions, creating an alternate existence at the margins of society. Continuing to practice the trades they knew, but refusing to accept money as wages, they received only the necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter—which they shared among themselves and the poor. The brothers viewed their mission in society as calling their fellow Christians to lives of authentic conversion through the witness of their own lives and informal penitential preaching. After 1217, as Francis' Lesser Brothers spread throughout central Italy and to other parts of Western Europe, this continued at first to be the normal pattern of their life.

However, this radical new way of living Gospel values soon began attracting a significant number of clerics, especially as the brothers spread out from their original social context into Northern Italy and over the Alps. The Minorites, like the new Order of Preachers, offered a very attractive option for zealous clerics who desired to separate themselves from the careerism and corruption so rampant in their ranks, but who at the same time were reluctant to enter traditional forms of religious life—monks and canons regular—because most of these demanded that they relinquish an active pastoral ministry. Now, such idealistic young clerics had another option: the new mendicant orders, which offered both a way of life based on authentic Gospel values and at the same time provided a base from which to exercise a fruitful apostolic ministry.

Their assessment dovetailed with that of a number of perceptive prelates who recognized that Francis' brotherhood could be a potent force in advancing the church's agenda of pastoral reform. At the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the assembled bishops had belatedly recognized that the considerable appeal of contemporary heretical movements was largely the result of the church's failure to address popular religious needs.

[3] For a good concise summary of the history of the Franciscan movement before Bonaventure, see Grado Giovanni Merlo, "Storia di frate Francesco e dell' Ordine dei Minori," in *Francesco d'Assisi e il primo secolo di storia francescana* (Rome: 1997), 3–27, trans. by Edward Hagman, "The Story of Brother Francis and the Order of Friars Minor," *Greyfriars Review* 15 (2001): 1–21. For a fuller treatment, see Merlo, *In the Name of St. Francis*, 25–200.

Strenuous efforts would have to be taken to provide a better-educated clergy who could lead the laity to a reasonable understanding of the essentials of Christian faith and practice. The Council envisioned that the chief means to accomplish this goal would be through a campaign of doctrinal preaching and one-to-one pastoral guidance in the sacrament of confession. It mandated that bishops appoint "suitable men to carry out (. . .) the duty of sacred preaching (. . .) building up the people through word and example," who could also serve as "coadjutors (. . .) in hearing confessions and enjoining penances and other matters conducive to the salvation of souls."[4]

Dominic of Calaruega very consciously intended his new Order of Preachers to be a task force to implement these aims, but the Lesser Brothers—originally a predominantly lay movement—were also quickly swept up in the currents of this dynamic reform agenda. Already in 1219, Honorius III was commending the new brotherhood to bishops, emphasizing the role it could play in "sowing the seed of the Word of God" among the people—but in doing so, the Pope was accentuating the contribution of the ordained friars.[5] Already in the 1221 redaction of Francis' *Earlier Rule*, it is evident that some of the brothers were being specifically designated as preachers. In fact, the initial missions of brothers sent to Germany (1221) and England (1224) included a high proportion of clerics. A trend was becoming evident: "the more the Franciscans were seen as invaluable collaborators of the clergy, the greater the pressure upon them to become clerics."[6] By the mid-1220s, the Lesser Brothers were being granted their own churches; soon steps were taken to organize a system of education within the order so that friars with the requisite background could receive the theological training necessary to equip them for a pastoral ministry in the Church. By 1237, Gregory IX would claim that the Order of Lesser Brothers had been founded to spread the Gospel of Christ, a goal especially realized through its preaching against heresy and hearing the

[4] *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (Washington: 1990), 239–240.

[5] *Cum dilecti* (11 June 1219); *Pro dilectis* (29 May 1220), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, ed. J.H. Sbaraglia (Rome: 1759–1768): 1:2, 5, nn. 2 and 4. English translation from *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*, ed. Regis Armstrong, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, and William Short, hereafter FA:ED (New York: 1999–2002), vol. 1, 558–560. On the developments described in this paragraph, see Lawrence Landini, *The Causes of the Clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor 1209–1260* (Chicago: 1968).

[6] Manselli, 88.

confessions of the faithful.[7] As Manselli sums up: "The historical circumstances of the church at that time were impelling the Order to make some kind of decision regarding the two roads opening up before it: to become definitively a religious order (which inevitably implied a transformation into a complex of friars who would be almost all clerics), or to remain a religious movement of lay people among lay people (. . .) operating as an internal stimulus within contemporary society by example and penitential preaching."[8] The main body of the Order, with the encouragement of the papacy, chose the first path.

New Directions

In 1239, the new directions were sealed by a *coup* engineered by prominent clerics of the Order with the support of Gregory IX; the first priest, Albert of Pisa, was selected as minister general. Over the next few years, he and his successor, Haymo of Faversham, presided over what contemporaries recognized as a "reformation" of the Lesser Brothers:[9] legislation was enacted to write into law the clericalized version of its mission that was becoming increasingly dominant in practice. From now on, candidates to the order were required to have an educational background appropriate for theological training; other types of candidates were to be considered exceptions. However, this official "reformation" left many unresolved tensions both within and without the order: within, from those friars deeply attached to their primitive way of life who considered the transformation of the brotherhood as a betrayal of their founder's fundamental ideals; without, from many secular clergy as well as the rival Dominicans, who viewed the Franciscans as illegitimately encroaching on their turf. It was with these forces that Bonaventure would have to contend as minister general.

But what exactly was Bonaventure's role in this "reformation" process? A number of modern historians have attempted to portray Bonaventure

---

[7] *Quoniam abundavit* (6 April 1237), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, 214–15, n. 224 (FA:ED 1, 575–577).

[8] Raoul Manselli, *St. Francis of Assisi* (Saint Bonaventure: 1984), 89.

[9] Both Jordan of Giano (*Chronicle*, 63–65) and Thomas of Eccleston (*The Coming of the Friars Minor to England*, 13) refer to the "reformation" of the order during these years. See the translation by Placid Hermann, *Thirteenth Century Chronicles* (Chicago: 1961), 65–67 and 152–160. For a thorough treatment of these events, see Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government*, 181–246.

as the "second founder" of the order through his work as minister general, establishing his order as a clericalized brotherhood, devoted primarily to pastoral ministry in the church.[10] Such an assessment gives Bonaventure too much credit—or blame. It is important to recognize from the start that he was already a product of this transformed Minorite order, not its creator. Although, during his youth in central Italy, he would have certainly come to know the Lesser Brothers—itinerants working at menial trades and engaging in informal street preaching—Bonaventure was not impelled to join them. However, when he arrived in Paris in 1235 as an enterprising young student of arts, he encountered a different breed of Lesser Brothers who would prove to be much more attractive. The Lesser Brothers in Paris had moved from their original base on the outskirts of the city into the University quarter in 1230, to more easily engage in their preaching ministry and to better avail themselves of a theological education. The year after Bonaventure's arrival, the Minorites scored a remarkable coup when a leading member of the theology faculty, Alexander of Hales, entered their lowly brotherhood, bringing his chair with him, thus making the brothers an integral part of the University. Bonaventure was soon drawn to this idealistic, articulate, and pastorally-committed brotherhood. He entered the order in Paris in 1243.

About a decade later, as the recently-appointed regent of the Minors' school of theology, Bonaventure penned a response to an inquirer, an unknown master of arts at the University who was contemplating entering the Minorite order but was hesitant because of what he perceived as inconsistencies in their way of life.[11] Apparently, a certain Dominican was attempting to discredit the Franciscans by pointing out apparent contradictions between the Lesser Brothers' humble origins and professed Rule and their increasingly sophisticated activities in Paris. Bonaventure's response indicates he was far from embarrassed by the situation:

> Let it not disturb you that in the beginning our brothers were simple and unlettered; rather this very fact ought to strengthen your faith in the Order. For I confess before God that what made me love St Francis's way of life so much was that it is exactly like the origin and perfection of the Church

[10] Such as Moorman, 154.

[11] The Latin text was first published by the Quaracchi editors (8, 331–336), and more recently by F.-M. Delorme, "Textes franciscaines," *Archivio italiano per la storia della pieta* 1 (1951): 209–218. See introduction and translation, "A Letter in Response to an Unknown Master," 13, in *Works of St Bonaventure* 5, 39–56. The most thorough discussion of this letter is in Pellegrini, "Introduzione," *Opuscoli Francescani* 1, 13–22.

> itself, which began first with simple fishermen and afterwards developed to include the most illustrious and learned doctors. You find the same thing in the Order of St Francis; in this way God shows that it did not come about through human calculations but through Christ. For since the works of Christ do not diminish but ceaselessly grow, this undertaking was proved to be God's doing when wise men did not disdain to join the company of simple folk.[12]

It is evident that Bonaventure considered the striking transformation the order had undergone since the death of St Francis, not as a betrayal of its roots, but as a providential flowering. To him, it was obvious that God had destined the Lesser Brothers to take up a prominent role in the pastoral ministry of Christ's church. Indeed, their apostolic way of life made them pre-eminently qualified to do so: "Who are better fit to teach the Gospel than those who profess and observe it?"[13] The rest of this letter indicates that Bonaventure interpreted the other facets of Franciscan life in light of this vocation to be evangelical preachers in the church.

Yes, Bonaventure conceded that the brothers' Rule commanded that the brothers be poor, "not acquiring anything as their own, neither a house nor place nor anything at all."[14] But clearly this did not imply that they should not have books or live in a regular religious house! After all, Bonaventure argued, the Rule also stated "in no uncertain terms that the brothers have the right and duty of preaching."[15] Such a mandate implied that they first immerse themselves in the Word of God. The brothers therefore clearly required books and an appropriate space to study. Although it was true that Francis called his brothers to be "pilgrims and strangers in this world," that did not demand they should actually lead an itinerant existence. Indeed, Bonaventure described such a way of life as "stupid"

---

[12] *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 13: "Nec te moveat quod fratres fuerunt in principio simplices et illiterati, immo magis debet hoc in te fidem ordinis confirmare. Fateor coram Deo quod hoc est quod me fecit vitam beati Francisci maxime diligere, quia similis est initio et perfectioni ecclesiae, quae primo incepit a piscatoribus simplicibus et post modum profecit ad doctores clarissimos et peritissimos; sic videbis in religione beati Francisci, ut ostendat Deus, quod non fuit per hominum prudentiam inventa, sed per Christum; et quia opera Christi non deficiunt sed proficiunt, ostenditur hoc opus fuisse Divinum, dum ad consortium virorum simplicium etiam sapientes non sunt dedignati descendere." English trans., WSB 5, 54.

[13] "Quos enim magis decet docere Evangelium quam qui Evangelium profitentur et servant." *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 11 (WSB 5, 51).

[14] See Francis of Assisi, *Later Rule*, 6.1 (FA:ED 1, 103).

[15] "Clamat regula expresse imponens fratribus auctoritatem et officium praedicandi." *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 6–7. Actually, the Rule states that the office of preaching could be conferred on certain friars (*Later Rule*, 9.2).

and "worthless," totally inimical to a sense of religious discipline, which demanded fixed residences. Rather, to fulfill their mission in the church, the Lesser Brothers legitimately made use of all kinds of things, including books and permanent dwellings—the contrary would be "insane." But despite this, the friars remained pilgrims in spirit, because they did not appropriate these resources as their own.[16]

This God-given pastoral ministry of the order also raised the issue of its economic support. Yes, Francis had clearly spoken in the Rule of the manual work to which the brothers were to be devoted. However, Bonaventure believed that the founder did not intend this as a command, but rather considered manual labor only as an appropriate "means of avoiding idleness." He was convinced that the activities of study and preaching that occupied the time of most of his brothers today were clearly superior to physical labor.[17] Bonaventure had to acknowledge that abandoning manual labor in favor of spiritual work had made contemporary friars more dependent on alms for their support; in fact, some brothers had to devote themselves to begging in order to support their confreres who were engaged in preaching and study. But did not Francis strictly command his brothers to "in no way receive money, either personally or through an intermediary"?[18] If so, how was the order to support itself?

Bonaventure relies on the solution advanced by Gregory IX's 1230 bull *Quo elongati*, allowing potential donors to entrust their alms to a lay person designated by the friars, who could then assist them by procuring necessities for their use. Such a person, the Pope had argued, was not the friars' intermediary—something clearly forbidden by the Rule—but simply a convenient agent that donors could employ in order to funnel their alms to the friars.[19] In sum, this little treatise offers a forceful *apologia* on Bonaventure's part for the "clerical, educated, urban, and conventual" way of life his order had increasingly assumed by this time, and which his own life as a student and teacher took for granted.[20] That perspective would shape his vision as minister general.

---

[16] *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 8.

[17] *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 9.

[18] *Later Rule*, 4.

[19] *Tri. quaes. mag.*, 3–5. For *Quo elongati*, see *Bullarium Franciscanum* 1, 68–70, n. 56. (FA:ED 1, 570–575).

[20] The quotation is from Duncan Nimmo, *Reform and Division in the Medieval Franciscan Order* (Rome: 1987): "To summarize, we may say that during the 13th century the Franciscan Order became clerical, educated, urban, and conventual. Each characteristic spelt a modification of the fraternity's primitive pattern" (55).

Initial Controversy

It is important to remember that Bonaventure penned this *Response to Three Questions of an Unknown Master* in the midst of a virulent attack on the claims of the new mendicant orders launched by the secular masters of theology at the University of Paris. They were simply articulating in more sophisticated terms the complaints of a large number of clergy irritated by the friars' increasing involvement in the pastoral ministry. From their perspective, the mendicants were cuckoos raiding the nest that rightfully belonged to the local bishop and his clergy. Armed with papally-granted exemptions, the Dominicans and Franciscans were competing with the canonically established structures of pastoral care and so undermining the authority—and incomes—of the legitimate pastors. The chronicler Salimbene would later vividly recount a conversation in which his interlocutor nicely summarized why the friars were "hated and despised" by many secular clergy:

> First, they complain that you do not preach that tithes ought to be paid to them. Second, that you bury the dead in your convents. Third, that against their will you hear the confessions of their parishioners. Fourth, that you have completely taken over the office of preaching from them (…) Fifth, that you make problems for them on solemn feast days because your conventual Mass draws away all their offerings. Sixth, that you are great ladies' men, that is you like to talk with women.[21]

These squabbles escalated to a much more ominous level, however, when the visionary apocalyptic imagery of the Calabrian abbot Joachim of Fiore was injected into the mix. As developed in a later work attributed to him, a millennial "contemplative church" would arise out of a period of great tribulation in the midst of which "spiritual men" would be raised up by God to strengthen authentic believers.[22] These ideas were especially congenial to the Lesser Brothers who naturally saw themselves as agents of renewal in the church during these critical "last days." Such views had been spreading rapidly in the order since the 1230s. Among the friars

---

[21] The *Chronicle* of Salimbene de Adam, trans. Joseph L. Baird et al. (Binghamton: 1986), 427. The reference to women is likely due to the friars' close association with women lay penitents such as Beguines.

[22] For a good introduction to Joachim's thought, see Bernard McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot, Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought* (New York: 1985). The role of the 'spiritual men" was accentuated in a pseudo-Joachite work, the *Commentary on Jeremiah*.

who shared this Joachite vision was the minister general himself, John of Parma. As Bernard McGinn has pointed out, John of Parma was highly influential in disseminating the three major components of "Franciscan Joachitism": namely, the identification of the Franciscans and Dominicans as Joachim's two hoped-for orders of *viri spirituali*, the emphasis on absolute poverty of life as the characteristic sign of the "spiritual men," and granting Francis a unique role in salvation history by identifying him with the angel of the sixth seal (Rev. 7:2), the harbinger of the final age.[23]

This apocalyptic ferment erupted violently in 1254 with the appearance of a tract by a young Minorite student at Paris, Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, the *Liber Introductorius ad Evangelium Aeternum*.[24] This work was a selection of extracts from Joachim's writings accompanied by a radical preface suggesting that they comprised a "new and eternal" Testament of the prophesied age of the Spirit. According to Gerardo, with the dawning of this new era, the structures of the institutional church would wither away, to be supplanted by a charismatic community guided by the friars.[25] Gerardo's work was immediately pounced upon by the secular masters as proof that the mendicants were indeed an apocalyptic force, not however as the hoped-for "spiritual men," but rather as agents of the Anti-Christ. Their leader, William of Saint-Amour, argued that the Dominicans and Franciscans were undermining the divinely-established constitution of the church, in which the pastoral care of the faithful was entrusted to the bishops and the diocesan clergy, not to religious, who were supposed to leave the world for a life of prayer and manual labor. William went on to criticize the Pope for trespassing on the rights of the local church by illegitimately granting exemptions to the mendicants.

This alarm soon reached the ears of Rome: Innocent IV quickly appointed a commission to examine Gerard's *Introductorius*, but far worse for the friars, he issued a decree drastically cutting back their ministerial

---

[23] Bernard McGinn, "Apocalypticism and Church Reform: 1150–1500," in *The Continuum History of Apocalypticism*, eds. Bernard McGinn, John Collins, Stephen Stein (New York: 2003), 284–285.

[24] For a history of the secular-mendicant conflict, see Decima Douie, *The Conflict between the Seculars and Mendicants at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century* (London: 1954) and M.M. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et le polémique universitaire parisienne 1250–1259* (Paris: 1972).

[25] For an analysis of Gerardo's work, see Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: 1969), 59–70.

privileges.[26] Two weeks later, however, Pope Innocent was dead. Luckily for the mendicants, his successor, Alexander IV, was Rainaldo da Jenne, the long-time cardinal protector of the order. Although Alexander quickly revoked Innocent's harmful decree, the controversy at the University of Paris continued to rage. In reply to Gerard's attacks on mendicant poverty, Bonaventure responded with his *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection*, defending in a particular way the Minorite mode of life as a privileged expression of Gospel values. Bonaventure argued strenuously that the summit of a truly evangelical life involved the renunciation of all things, both individually and corporately, and that begging—living off alms collected daily—was an important ingredient of that perfection. This work helped establish Bonaventure's reputation, not simply as a leading theologian, but as an eloquent defender of the friars.

The two extreme positions in this conflict eventually earned papal condemnation. As a result of the papal investigation of his *Introductorius*, Gerard's radical Joachite teachings were condemned as heretical in October 1255. And William of Saint-Amour soon found himself in a similar position. In July of the following year, chiefly due to his challenge to papal authority, his treatise attacking the mendicants was also condemned, and he was forced to leave the theology faculty. However, the fall-out from the controversy was to claim a more highly-placed victim: the Minorite minister general, John of Parma. John was simply too strongly identified with suspect Joachite ideas to survive.[27] Pope Alexander, who had retained the position of cardinal protector of the order as a conspicuous sign of his support, suggested that John advance the general chapter scheduled for Pentecost of 1257. When the delegates gathered in Rome in February of that year, John tendered his resignation. For a whole day, the assembly tried to urge him to remain in office, but he remained adamant. The friars then asked him to suggest a successor. John "immediately selected Brother Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, saying that he knew not a better man in the entire Order. They all immediately agreed, and Bonaventure was elected."[28]

---

[26] *Etsi animarum*, 21 Nov, 1254 (*Bullarium Franciscanum* Epitome, 259–261, n. 28). Inter alia, the friars could no longer admit laity to their services on Sundays and feast days or hear any lay person's confession without the approval of his or her parish priest.

[27] Indeed, a joint encyclical letter by John and Humbert of Romans, Master General of the Dominicans, in February 1255, at the very time the *Introductorius* was under examination for heresy, is replete with Joachite allusions to the providential role of the friars in salvation history. See FA:ED 2, 771–772.

[28] Salimbene, *Chronicle*, p. 309.

A New Minister General

And so it was that Bonaventure, immersed in his duties at the School of Minorites in Paris, suddenly found himself the minister general of a fractious 30,000-member brotherhood.[29] It would have taken well over a month for news of his election to reach Paris. After having been informed of his election and considering the recommendations of the chapter, Bonaventure realized he had to act quickly on two fronts: first, to challenge his brothers to live up to their vocation as authentic Gospel preachers, and to ensure the support of the papacy for the order's role in the church. Indeed, these two goals would dominate Bonaventure's entire tenure as general minister. He moved quickly on the first front: on 23 April 1257, he issued an encyclical letter "to all the provincial ministers and custodians of the order."[30] It was apparently customary for a newly elected general to issue such a letter to the order as a kind of "inaugural address," but at this critical moment it was especially important for all the brothers to know that a firm hand was at the helm of the order.

The tone of Bonaventure's first encyclical letter provides a striking contrast to the triumphalistic, even smug tone he had taken just a few years earlier in the *Letter in Response to Three Questions of an Unknown Master*. There, Bonaventure had dismissed allegations that the friars were not living up to their espoused values, on the ground that such behavior was an exception, not the "general state" of the order.[31] The encyclical letter, on the other hand, calls attention to such failings, not as isolated abuses, but rather as aberrant tendencies that were unfortunately becoming more and more prevalent, making the order "an object of loathing and contempt" among lay people.[32] Bonaventure was well aware that the charges leveled by William of Saint-Amour—that the friars were "hypocrites" parading about barefoot and in austere garments, but actually seeking a comfortable life for themselves—were not entirely groundless. Although the mendicants may have emerged victorious from the immediate battle in Paris

---

[29] The number of friars at the time is calculated on the basis of a decree of the chapter of Narbonne in 1260 stating that 2,100 friars had died in the three years since the last chapter. On this basis, historians estimate that the total number of Friars Minor must have been at least 30–35,000. See Ferdinand Delorme, "Diffinitiones capituli generalis capituli generalis O.F.M. Narbonensis (1260)," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 3 (1910): 502.

[30] Published in the Quaracchi edition (8, 468–69). English trans., WSB 5, 57–62.

[31] *Tri. Ques. Mag.* 2.

[32] *Epis.* 1: "Cum Ordo deberet esse sanctitatis totius speculum, in diversis orbis partibus in taedium vertitur et contemptum."

thanks to unstinting papal support, Bonaventure knew that their winning the long-term war of public opinion depended on their actually living the apostolic life of poor Gospel preachers they professed. He intended to challenge his brothers to that reality.

He enumerated a long list of abuses which were causing scandal both to secular persons and to the friars themselves, mostly involving growing laxity in regard to the observance of poverty: a free use of money, importunate begging, and poaching on sources of revenue traditionally reserved to the diocesan clergy. Such behavior was symptomatic of the fact that his brothers were "no longer content with little," but were demanding more and better belongings. Particularly troublesome in this regard was the escalating tendency among the friars to abandon smaller dwellings on the outskirts of towns and embark on the construction of places in more central locations on a much grander scale.[33] Other abuses, such as idleness and inappropriate relations with lay women, were also singled out.

What was Bonaventure's plan to remedy the situation? Basically, it was to urge the brothers to recommit themselves to their foundational document—the Rule of 1223 as interpreted by authoritative Papal declarations and the ordinances and constitutions issued by earlier chapters. Bonaventure saw himself essentially as a "sentinel," sounding the alarm so that the responsible authorities at the regional and local levels—the provincial ministers and custodians—might rein in aberrant tendencies, seeing to it that the legislation of the order was enforced, and summoning friars to return to the ideals of their profession. The only specific command that he issued was to require his personal permission to change the location of a friary.[34] Bonaventure concluded by stating he intended to use "all

[33] This movement can be traced by the fact that Franciscans did not legally own their places, and so needed permission to sell or obtain property from the Holy See. From 1228 to 1240, only ten faculties to relocate or enlarge Franciscan premises were granted. This movement began to pick up in the early 1240s, when nine permissions were granted, but from 1244 to 1257 over one hundred such authorizations were issued (Gratien, 157–167). This acquisition of urban sites was one of the chief sources of conflict with the diocesan clergy.

[34] As Bonaventure mentions, John of Parma also enunciated such a policy, Apparently, many of the papal bulls authorizing property transfers were being granted in response to direct petitions of provincial ministers or even local superiors. We know of at least two cases for which Bonaventure granted this permission in the next two years (*Bullarium Franciscanum*, 2, 249 and 319).

his powers" to begin eradicating the lax practices he had mentioned.[35] Exactly what, however, did those powers entail?

Despite the fact that Francis spoke eloquently of the manner in which the minister general was to conduct himself in service of his brothers, the canonical Rule of 1223 did not really spell out those duties.[36] It certainly made it clear that he was the supreme authority in the Order: all the brothers were bound under obedience to obey him. The one body which might possibly act as a check, the general chapter, was summoned at his discretion, and even then, its relation to the minister was not defined. Much depended on the way in which the charismatic leader of the order chose to relate to it. The one power the chapter did enjoy was that of replacing the minister general if it came to the conclusion that he was no longer "qualified for the service and general welfare of the brothers."[37] But if the minister general did not summon a chapter, how was he to be removed? Other than this vague statement, there were few brakes on his authority. The general appointed the provincial ministers, who were thus his representatives in the provinces; they in turn appointed the custodians (regional superiors) and local guardians. The well-being of the order, then, was highly dependent on the personality and policies of one man. Such was the situation under Francis himself, John Parenti, and Elias—as Jacques Dalarun aptly described it: "1209 to 1239 are thirty years of a continuously autocratic exercise of power, within a highly centralized and hierarchical organization."[38]

The role of the general minister, however, was dramatically altered by the legislation issued in the wake of the clerical "coup" at the chapter of 1239. That assembly, reacting against the alleged abuses of Elias, was determined that no future general would be able to dominate the order as he had. As part of the "reformation" of the Lesser Brothers, this chapter and its successor of 1242 turned to the Dominican constitutions as a pattern, and enacted legislation essentially transforming the Franciscan Order into a federation of provinces rather than a highly centralized brotherhood. First of all, the minister general would no longer appoint the provincial ministers; from now on, the brothers in each province gathered

---

[35] *Epis.* 5: "Oportet me tamen, conscientia compellente, totis viribus exstirpationi intendere praedictorum" (WSB 5, 62).

[36] The earlier draft of the Rule contains a wonderful description of the role of ministers in chapters 4, 5, and 6; however, the canonical Rule of 1223 has only terse statements in chapters 8 and 9 (FA:ED 1, 66–68, 104–105).

[37] LR 8.4.

[38] Jacques Dalarun, *Francis of Assisi and Power* (Saint Bonaventure: 2007), 107.

in chapter to select a minister for themselves; the minister general's role was reduced to simply confirming the validity of the election. Furthermore, the new legislation also made it clear that supreme authority in the entire order was vested in the general chapter, now regularly scheduled every three years, whose task it was to determine policy, enact legislation, and elect a minister general to execute the decisions that it had made. Indeed, the first item of business at the next chapter was to evaluate the general's administration of the Order over the previous term and to decide whether or not to renew his mandate. A certain fundamental unity within the entire order was maintained by the uniform legislation enacted at the general chapter and a system of visitation intended to ensure that these norms were being observed on the local level.[39]

Perhaps this system of government might be clearer if its complex workings were illustrated. The Franciscan general chapter of Rome that elected Bonaventure in 1257 was a large assembly of almost a hundred members. Each of the order's 32 provinces was represented by three delegates: its provincial minister; one of its custodians or regional superiors, chosen from among themselves; and one other delegate selected by the previous provincial chapter. That fall, brothers of each province would then meet in chapter to discuss how to implement the legislation enacted at the general chapter and to choose a provincial minister. Another round of provincial chapters would follow in 1258. After that, a friar visitor who had been named at the general chapter of 1257 would begin a process of inspecting each province to assess how well the legislation of the order was being carried out; the visitor would make a report to the provincial chapter of 1259, which in turn would consider the issues raised and submit suggestions for agenda items, along with the visitor's report, to the general chapter of 1260. It is clear that the authority of the minister general in this process had been substantially reduced in favor of a very collegial system of government.

But even with this reduced role, the office of minister general still remained an important factor in maintaining the unity of the brotherhood. First of all, every friar was bound to obey him by virtue of his

[39] Thus Bonaventure's first encyclical level states that he will learn from the visitors at the time of the next chapter whether or not the provincials were complying with his directives. The visitors themselves, however, were selected, not by the general minister, but by the chapter itself.

profession.[40] Because of this relationship, the minister general was the living focal point of the order's unity, functioning as its chief executive and supreme judge, entrusted with the *cura animarum* of all its members. The chapter was in session only for several weeks every three years; once it adjourned, the minister general was left in complete control of the whole order. He enjoyed immense discretionary power; there was no standing definitorium or governing council whose consent he needed for any of his decisions. He could freely assign friars anywhere in the order, impose temporary ordinances, grant privileges and dispensations, and adjudicate cases. Certainly, his powers were limited both by custom and prudent political judgment; he knew his conduct would be closely reviewed at the next general chapter. But the vast power which rested in his office meant that the over-all health of the order was inextricably tied to his own vision and abilities.

Bonaventure made major efforts to bolster his authority by invoking papal support: shortly after his election, the procurators of the order already obtained a papal bull reminding all the brothers that no one could claim exemption from the common law of the order.[41] But later in the year, Bonaventure petitioned Alexander IV to strengthen his authority over friars who cavalierly disregarded the order's statutes, by forbidding all friars to use any personal privilege or execute any charge without the express permission of the minister general.[42]

The Rule stated that the first duty of the ministers was to "visit and admonish" the brothers to remain faithful to the basic values implied by their profession.[43] This work of "admonition" was of course a never-ending task, and Bonaventure made impressive efforts to summon the order to the continual conversion of mind and heart of which it always stood in need. In that sense, he was a "keen reformer."[44] One major thrust of his efforts was to clarify exactly what the order expected of his members and to hold them to it. Undoubtedly, Bonaventure's greatest and most enduring contribution in this regard was to organize the haphazard legislation of the order which he had inherited into a set of constitutions that would

---

[40] LR 8.1: "Let all the brothers always be bound to have one of the brothers of this Order as general minister and servant of the whole fraternity and let them be strictly bound to obey him" (FA:ED 1, 104).

[41] *Odore suavi* (27 February 1257), *Bullarium Franciscanum* 1, 408.

[42] *Ut ministerium* (21 Oct 1257), *Bullarium Franciscanum* 2, 253.

[43] LR 10.1.

[44] Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government*, 283.

establish uniform standards of observance and provide the teeth to ensure compliance.

Gathering and Formulating Legislation

Early on in his administration, Bonaventure discovered that his inaugural policy of recalling the friars to their foundational values was being frustrated by the lack of a systematic collection of the order's existing legislation. The problem was not a lack of laws; many decrees had been promulgated over the past two decades, but they were poorly organized and thus difficult to remember and consult. As a result, they were too often ignored by the majority of friars and perhaps even by provincial ministers. Bonaventure's systematic mind soon set to work to being some logic to the existing hodge-podge. Like the great general of the Dominicans, Raymond of Peñafort, Bonaventure worked to codify the constitutions governing his brotherhood, presenting his work to the first general chapter at which he presided,[45] held at Narbonne in 1260, where they were approved. Next only to the Rule itself, they would establish the pattern of Franciscan life for generations.

In their early years, the Lesser Brothers had not needed a set of constitutions. Unlike their mendicant counterparts, the Preaching Friars, who professed a "canonized" Rule, that of St Augustine, and thus had to quickly generate a set of particular statutes to adapt that Rule to the specific genius of their order, the Franciscans' situation was much more fluid. The Gospel way of life they had professed was not yet fixed; the text of their Rule was still evolving in order to meet new situations. However, this could no longer continue after the definitive papal approval of the Rule in 1223; the Franciscans' foundational document was now also imbedded in church law; new legislation would have to be drawn up to adapt it to changing conditions. However, the order was slow to move in this direction; it seems that for some years, its leaders, John Parenti and Elias, were content to rely on the "common law" of living tradition; very few new laws were introduced.

---

[45] Raymond, elected third master general of the Order of Preachers in 1238, presented a sweeping revision of the primitive Dominican constitutions to the general chapter the following year. See William Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols. (New York: 1965–73), 1, 172. For the text of the Constitutions, see WSB 5, 76–135.

According to the chronicler Salimbene, the first major spate of legislative activity in the order's history occurred only after the removal of Elias, in the chapter of 1239, and its successors of 1240 and 1242, under the leadership of Haymo of Faversham.[46] For years, however, the content of these earlier constitutions was a matter of conjecture, as no copy of them was known to have survived. This made it very difficult to assess the real significance of Bonaventure's codification. As result, many historians credited—or blamed—Bonaventure for making major innovations in Franciscan life through his Constitutions of Narbonne.[47]

An exception to this tendency was Rosalind Brooke, who relied on the testimony of early chronicles that described Bonaventure's contribution as one of organization rather than innovation.[48] Her judgment, therefore, was that "Bonaventure probably inserted little that was new (in the Constitutions). (. . .) It is inherently unlikely that a thoughtful chairman would try to direct a General Chapter to consider and approve a major edition of existing constitutions and a major programme of new legislative proposals at one and the same time."[49]

Brooke's intuition has been vindicated in recent years by the dogged archival work of Cesare Cenci, who unearthed several incomplete copies of the earlier versions of the constitutions, making it possible to assess Bonaventure's contributions to their development with some degree of precision for the first time.[50] Those sections of the older constitutions which have survived demonstrate clearly that Bonaventure's Narbonne codification did not propose dramatic changes; in fact, in most cases he

---

[46] Salimbene complained that "the fourth fault of Brother Elias was that during his entire term of office there were no constitutions instituted to govern the Order and thereby to attain the desirable goals of preserving the Rule and regulating the Order and making it uniform (. . .). However, this [goal] was fulfilled in the following year [1239] when Brother Elias was deposed and a great many rules were drawn up" (*Chronicle*, 81–83).

[47] For example, Moorman (147–154), following Ehrle.

[48] The most important of these was Salimbene, who said: "at that chapter (1239), a large number of constitutions were written, although they were not organized until later under the Minister Generalate of Brother Bonaventure, at which time they were codified by Bonaventure, although he added very few of his own, save that indeed he changed the penalties in certain cases" (*Chronicle*, 150–151).

[49] Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government*, 276.

[50] Cesare Cenci, "De Fratrum Minorum Constitutionibus Praenarbonensibus," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 83 (1990): 50–95; "Fragmenta Priscarum Constitutionum Prenarbonensium" *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 96 (2003): 289–300, and "Vestigia Constitutionum Prenarbonensium," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 97 (2004): 61–98.

hardly altered the wording of the existing legislation. His contribution was largely in terms of organization and style.[51]

This discovery hardly minimizes the significance of Bonaventure's edition, however. First of all, this law code, unlike its predecessor, is uniquely Franciscan: Bonaventure decided to organize the 255 prescriptions into twelve "rubrics," each prefaced by topical quotations from the Rule. The first seven were devoted to the friars' way or life and their ministry:

1) Entrance into the order, which laid down the renunciation of one's property as the foundation of Minorite life. It also describes the initial formation process.[52]
2) Quality of dress. Characteristics of the common habit, going barefoot.
3) The observance of poverty. An extensive chapter, banning the reception of money, as well as regulating the quality of buildings and belongings.
4) Religious practices in friaries. Regulations concerning fasting, silence, daily schedule, and tonsure.
5) Behavior outside friaries. Regulations concerning traveling (needed for an apostolic life involving time outside the convent).
6) The work of the brothers. An extensive chapter dealing with preaching, hearing confessions, and studies. It is clear that Bonaventure presumes pastoral ministry to be the major work of the friars.
7) The correction of delinquent behavior. Again, an extensive chapter.

The remaining five chapters deal with the structures of governance: 8) general visitation; 9) election of the general and provincial ministers, custodians, and guardians; 10) the provincial chapter; 11) the general chapter; 12) suffrages for the deceased friars.

Bonaventure's arrangement was designed so that his brothers would approach their constitutions, not simply as a bunch of random laws, but as a systematic application of the order's foundational document in concrete terms for their own situation. This was to be their enduring impact: by means of the constitutions, friars were shown how to pattern their

[51] Indeed, Bonaventure himself alludes to this effort in the prologue to the Constitutions: "Quia vero confusio est enim intelligentiae quam memoriae inimica, expedit ut Constitutionum varietas ad certos titulos reducantur": "Since confusion is opposed to the intelligence as well as to the memory, it has seemed advisable to arrange the multiplicity of constitutions according to specific topics" (WSB 5, 75).

[52] WSB 5, 76–79. This was one of the rubrics where Bonaventure's initiative was most apparent. See Pellegrini, *Opuscoli Francescani* 1, 30–31.

daily life and work in accordance with the Rule they had professed, but in a way that expressed their current lived reality.

In a very perspicuous reading of the constitutions, Timothy Johnson has suggested that Bonaventure's edition of Narbonne offers "a theoretical construct for containing, organizing, and harmonizing his confreres' charism along the lines of the predominant urban and conventual reality of Minorite ministry" as it had emerged by the 1240s.[53] The days of uneducated lay friars roaming the streets, working at menial jobs and engaging in freelance penitential preaching, were fast disappearing. There was need for systematic legislation that addressed the more stable contemporary reality of Franciscan life, and that interpreted the friars' Rule in those terms. Bonaventure's constitutions take for granted that the bulk of a friar's life would be spent within the walls of a local convent and its church, where people come for pastoral services.[54] Time outside the friary was strictly regulated.[55] The Narbonne constitutions, in that sense, provided a theoretical structural enclosure of disciplinary regulations parallel to the physical one that increasingly enveloped urban Minorite life. Failure to live up to their prescriptions—especially with regard to those abuses singled out by Bonaventure in his first encyclical letter—generally merited penances performed in the presence of the assembled community, thus marking out delinquents from the rest of the brothers in order to foster their reintegration into the body.[56]

Their rapid dissemination throughout the order and their mandatory monthly reading aloud to the friars did much to draw a fractious collection of local communities into a truly united brotherhood.[57] In an ironic

---

[53] Timothy Johnson, "Dispensations, Permissions, and the 'Narbonne Enclosure': The Spatial Parameters of Power in Bonaventure's 'Constitutions of Narbonne'," in *Oboedientia: Zu Formen und Grenzen von Macht und Unterordnung im mittelalterlichen Religiosentum*, ed. Sebastian Barret and Gert Melville (Vita Regularis. Ordnungen unde Deutungen religiosen Lebens in Mittelalter) 27 (Münster: 2005), 363–382. See also idem, " 'Ground to Dust for the Purity of the Order': Pastoral Power, Punishment, and Minorite Identity in the Narbonne Enclosure," *Franciscan Studies* 64 (2006): pp. 293–318; see also again the classic description by Duncan Nimmo (n. 20 above).

[54] On various norms of the Narbonne Constitutions and the rhythm of daily life in urban Minorite convents, see Pellegrini, *Opuscoli Francescani*, 33–38.

[55] *Const. Narb.* 5.1: "We decree that no brother is to be sent out from the house unless he be of mature behavior and then with a prudent and trustworthy companion. Upon their return to the house, the friars are to report to their guardian, confessing any transgression each other may have committed" (WSB 5, 54).

[56] Johnson, "Ground to Dust," 357.

[57] Impressed by Bonaventure's edition, the chapter of Narbonne (1260) demanded that every guardian "is to have the constitutions read publicly once a month, especially the

way, they would even influence Bonaventure's later treatment of the life of the founder himself; in his effort to portray Francis as a model of authentic Gospel life, Bonaventure took pains to emphasize how he exemplified behavior required of all friars by their constitutions.[58]

Subsequent General Chapters

The legislative task was, of course, not accomplished once for all by the Constitutions of Narbonne; new situations continued to arise. Subsequent general chapters supplemented them through additional legislation. Bonaventure assiduously summoned a general chapter every three years; adhering to the precedent established by John of Parma, now incorporated into the constitutions, he held these chapters alternately north and south of the Alps, so as to make the hardships involved in travelling more equitable.[59] Thus, after the chapter of Rome in 1257, chapters met in Narbonne (1260), Pisa (1263), Paris (1266), Assisi (1269), and Lyons (1272). This pattern was broken by the extraordinary chapter of 1274 in Lyons, which had been summoned by the Pope to meet concurrently with the general council held there that year. One major task of that chapter would be to elect a successor to Bonaventure, who had been appointed cardinal bishop of Albano the preceding year.

It is clear that Bonaventure exercised a major role at these general chapters. At five of them, the first order of business was to examine his performance over the previous three years and each, apparently pleased, chose to renew his mandate. For the rest of the session, therefore, a strong minister general like Bonaventure, who clearly enjoyed the confidence of the delegates, could have a major influence on its deliberations. As president of the chapter, he could sway the assembly to move in certain directions. This influence can certainly be perceived: more than once, a capitular ordinance was issued expressly at the wish of the minister general.[60] But there is little doubt that the vast majority of the decisions reflected his own opinions. Many of these decrees were not new legislation, but in

---

first seven chapters, which concern the whole community, at a time and place he deems appropriate." *Stat. Narb.* 1 (WSB 5, 138).

[58] For example, *Con Narb* 6.5 warns the friars against conversations with women; this is reinforced by the statement of the *Leg. maj.* 5.5. that Francis "used to say that conversation with a woman was frivolous except only for confession or a very brief instruction."

[59] *Const. Narb.* 11.2.

[60] For example, "Statutes Issued by the Chapter of Narbonne," nn. 3, 10, 17 (WSB 5, 138–141).

the nature of "admonitions," intended to remind friars of existing regulations, spelling out their implications or closing loopholes in them. All the provinces had been inspected by a visitor general within the previous two years, so on the basis of their reports to the chapter, particularly serious violations of the constitutions or widespread patterns of abuse could be addressed. For example, a major recurring theme in this legislation was the need to remind friars of the economic implications of being Lesser Brothers. They had to be forbidden to ask for money in their sermons; to carry purses on their cords; to have precious liturgical vessels in their churches,[61] or to use pewter or glass dinnerware at their tables.[62]

One interesting piece of legislation was the "Explanations of the Constitutions of Narbonne" issued during the chapter of Paris in 1266. The publication of a new fundamental code of law for the order in 1260 had apparently raised many questions regarding its interpretation. Soon there were many friars wondering if certain provisions applied to them. This rather lengthy document has the character of a *reportatio*—that is, notes taken on an oral presentation. It appears to have compiled from questions posed at the chapter, to which Bonaventure responded as minister general. To modern readers, this document seems pharisaical in its casuistry, but the concern of the questioners was not simply academic; the Lesser Brothers set great store by the observance of the constitutions, and accusations of failure in that regard were a prominent feature of their daily life. The Constitutions of Narbonne mandated a weekly chapter of faults in every house, where penances were assigned for breaches in observance. Furthermore, general visitors conducted a chapter in which all friars were supposed to report on any malfeasance by members of the community.[63] Friars naturally wanted to protect themselves against overly zealous accusers. In his responses, Bonaventure's judicious and practical temperament is evident. He certainly wanted to uphold a serious observance of the constitutions, but also avoided an intolerant literalism.

Encyclical Letters

Another vehicle Bonaventure employed to exercise his function of "admonition" within the order was the encyclical letter. Customarily issued at the close of general chapters, these were an opportunity for the minister

[61] "Statutes Issued by the Chapter of Narbonne," nn. 7, 8. 16 (WSB 5, 139–141).
[62] "Statutes Issued by the Chapter of Assisi," n. 9 (WSB 5, p. 241).
[63] *Const. Narb*. 7.20, 8.9–10. For the "Explanations," see WBS 5, 206–224.

general to provide a "state of the order address" to all the friars. They enabled him to address his brothers in a more personal way, exhorting them to a more faithful observance of their way of life. Two of Bonaventure's letters have survived in their entirety, the first, his inaugural letter after his election in 1257, which we have already examined; the second, following the chapter of 1266.[64] This second letter is Bonaventure's strongest published statement challenging his brothers to live up to their vocation as Lesser Brothers. Harsher in tone than its predecessor, it reveals that the undesirable tendencies he noted in 1257 were still very much evident, a situation made all the more distressing in light of the new general constitutions.[65] Bonaventure singled out three tendencies as especially troubling: the increasingly affluent life-style of the brothers, their tendency to criticize prelates, and their increasing competition with secular clergy to garner bequests. All these, he believed, were contrary to the spirit of poverty and humility that should characterize true Lesser Brothers. Bonaventure was especially harsh in his assessment of "the increasingly lavish style of our buildings and books, clothing and food (…). For it is truly a filthy, base lie for someone to claim to have voluntarily professed the highest poverty if he is not willing to put up with want, who at home enjoys the affluence of the rich and yet goes out to beg as poor people do."[66] Unfortunately, Bonaventure continued to be disappointed; the chapter of 1269 was still grappling with such issues, a striking testimony that aberrant practices had become deeply ingrained in the culture of some Franciscan provinces.[67]

---

[64] Cesare Cenci discovered fragments of a third such letter: "De Fratrum Minorum constitutionibus prenarbonensis," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 83 (1990): 63–64.

[65] Indeed, Peter of John Olivi, who was present at this chapter, recalled that Bonaventure made an emotional plea, stating "that there was no time since he became general minister when he would not have consented to be ground into dust if it would help the Order reach the purity of St. Francis and his companions": cited in Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans* (University Park, Pa.: 2001), 59–60.

[66] "Sumptuositatem aedificiorum librorumque, vestium ac ciborum (…). Foedum est enim profanumque mendacium summae paupertatis voluntarium se professorem asserere et rerum penuriam pati nolle, interius divitum instar affluere et exterius more pauperum mendicare" (WSB 5, 228).

[67] "Since up to now the rooting out of evils in our Order has been only partially successful (…) we enjoin all general visitors, that whenever they discover provinces which are corrupt, whether because of the accumulation of stores of grain, expensive buildings or clothing (…) or in the general relaxation of the regular discipline (…), they are bound to denounce both the ministers and the provinces as a whole to the general chapter." "Decrees Issued by the Chapter of Assisi (1269)," (WSB 5, 243).

Personal visitation of the order was the final means by which the minister general exercised his powers. In fact, the Rule, as we have mentioned, describes his function largely in the interpersonal terms of fraternal presence: visiting the brothers, upbuilding and admonishing them in a spirit of kindness and love. On such visits, Bonaventure could examine a local community's life, correct abuses, settle controversies, and listen patiently to personal concerns and requests. They also presented the opportunity for him to address regional gatherings of friars: the collection of his Seasonal Sermons alone contains some 54 sermons delivered to his confreres gathered in chapter.[68]

On the Road

Although Bonaventure did not attempt the same daunting visitation schedule of John of Parma's early years, nonetheless, fully a quarter of his days as minister general were spent quite literally on the road, as he traveled by foot or donkey throughout the order. There was no central "generalate" in Bonaventure's day; his small staff moved about with him. He actually continued to make Paris his principal residence. Undoubtedly, this was due to the fact that the city had become his home, but there were also several practical reasons for doing so. Especially during the controversies with the secular clergy at the beginning and then again at the close of his term, it was important for him to be near the University. Furthermore, the great convent of Paris was the most international community in the order and thus a good place for him to obtain news from all over Europe—at least from the perspective of its clerical elite. Unfortunately, the great convent was also a beehive of activity, and so Bonaventure chose often to make his base of operation while in the Paris area at the friary of Mantes-sur-Seine, a short distance from the city. This smaller house was close enough to the center of action, but at the same time provided him with some privacy and space for recollection.[69]

Nonetheless, Bonaventure was also absent from Paris from long stretches of time. Of course, his presence was sometimes required at the papal court, not simply to keep in personal contact with the Pope, but also to coordinate policies with the order's official procurators stationed there. Travelling even at a good speed of twenty miles a day, a trip from Paris to

[68] Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones de tempore* (Paris: 1990), 28.
[69] See Jacques Bougerol, *Saint Bonaventure* (Paris, 1963), p. 82.

Italy would have taken nearly two months,[70] but he naturally would break the trip and make detours in order to visit key friaries en route. Besides these two principal places of residence, Bonaventure also arranged more extensive visits to other parts of the order; he was able to get to all of the countries in Western Europe over the course of his time as minister general. The following outline gives Bonaventure's basic itinerary, as far as can be determined, during these years.[71] It includes only longer journeys, not the smaller trips he made once within a region. Especially in view of medieval travel conditions, it still is quite impressive seven and a half centuries later.

1257 at Paris when elected; trip to Italy to present himself to the Pope (April), returning to Paris in later summer.
1258 at Paris, and a visit to England in the fall.
1259 visit to Germany in the spring, then back to Paris; in late summer to Italy, then back to Lyons in late fall for the winter.
1260 leaves Lyons for Provence in the spring (Narbonne chapter), then to Italy for summer (consecration of church at La Verna, transfer of body of St Clare to new basilica), returning in fall to Paris.
1261 to Italy in the spring, then in fall to Provence.
1262 to Paris in the spring, then in early fall to Italy.
1263 in Italy (transfer of body of St Anthony to new basilica in Padua, chapter in Pisa), then in fall to Provence.
1264 to Italy in spring, then in autumn to Lyons.
1265 to Italy in spring, by late summer in Paris; visit to England, in late fall back to Italy (to refuse appointment as archbishop of York).
1266 to Paris in spring (general chapter), then visit through northern France and Low Countries.
1267 in Paris (new outbreak of secular-mendicant controversy.
1268 to Italy in late spring.
1269 in Italy (Assisi chapter), returning to Paris in late summer, then in late fall to Provence.
1270 visit through Spain in spring and summer, returning to Paris in early fall, then on a visit through Germany.

---

[70] See Norbert Ohler, *The Medieval Traveler*, trans. Caroline Hillier (Woodbridge: 1989), 97–101.

[71] Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson, NJ: 1963), 173–177; John Quinn, "Bonaventure, Saint," *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph Strayer et al. (New York: 1982–89), 2, 313–319.

1271 to Italy in spring.
1272 to Lyons in spring (general chapter), afterwards visiting southern France and Spain, ending at Lyons in late fall.
1273 to Paris in spring, summoned to Italy to be created cardinal, then to Lyons to make preparations for general council.
1274 at Lyons (leaves office at extraordinary general chapter, participates in council, death on 15 July).

This whole dimension of Bonaventure's exercise of leadership through personal contacts has of course been lost to us, as we are left today with only written documents whose public character conveys little of the warmth and personal charm for which he was noted. One story does reach us through Wadding's *Annales*: one time, as Bonaventure was on the road to a chapter, a friar came up to him and began pouring out his problems. Bonaventure stopped to give the man his full attention. Afterwards, his companions criticized him for wasting his time on such insignificant matters. He reminded them that he really could not do otherwise, saying: "After all, I am his minister and servant." There is also the famous tale about his being notified that he had been made cardinal while he was in the garden washing dishes; like John of Parma, Bonaventure helped with the ordinary tasks of the friaries he was visiting.[72]

Writings for the Order

Bonaventure was also convinced that as chief shepherd of the Lesser Brothers, he had responsibility for their spiritual formation. The various spiritual treatises he composed during his years as minister general were intended for the benefit of the friars themselves or for other religious women and men. The sophisticated *Journey of the Mind into God*, for example, was clearly aimed at educated friars, whereas the original audience for the *On Perfection of Life* was the Poor Clare community at Longchamp, outside Paris. It is clear Bonaventure had a special interest in his brothers who were engaged in to the pastoral ministry of the church to which the order was now so highly committed. His important synthesis of theology, the *Breviloquium*, completed around the time of his election as

[72] *Annales Minorum*, ed. Joseph Fonseca et al., 3rd ed., 32 volumes (Quaracchi: 1933–64), 4, 296–297 and 381–382.

minister general, was intended as an aid for friars engaged in theological studies.[73]

One of the most ambitious of Bonaventure's projects in this regard—what we would today call means of "ongoing education"—was the impressive collection of *Sunday Sermons* he compiled, most likely in 1267–68, to serve as a resource tool for friars in their preaching ministry.[74] Even in his first encyclical letter, Bonaventure expressed his concern about the inadequate preparation of friars for this office.[75] This massive collection—mostly consisting of sermons which were never actually proclaimed to a live congregation—was intended to help his brothers prepare themselves for this task. The artfully constructed sermons attempted to depict "the characteristics proper to the Minorite preacher,"[76] grounded in contemplative prayer and committed to pastoral application of the divine Word.

Bonaventure also showed a special concern for initial formation, and to this end composed a brief treatise for the instruction of novices.[77] This issue was a heightened concern for the new mendicant orders, which were forced to compress the initial training of their members into a relatively short period. Although a year of formal novitiate had been required of the Lesser Brothers by Honorius III in 1220, this proved to be another area in which they were slow to spell out the best way of implementing it. It appears that it was Bonaventure himself who took the initiative to enact some kind of formation program for the order in the Constitutions of Narbonne. This treatise, *Instructions for Novices*, seems to have been composed shortly after that legislation was enacted to assist novice directors in their task. Bonaventure adopts what he considered a tried-and-true monastic model in which the aspiring religious must literally die to the world to be reborn into a new identity. Therefore he emphasized that the novice had to break radically with his former life through a life of strict conventual discipline and practices of self-abasement designed to combat instinctive human pride and self-seeking behavior. Among such various formative activities, Bonaventure devotes considerable attention to a favorite topic: the meaning and method of true prayer, both personal

---

[73] See my introduction to the *Breviloquium*, WSB 9 (Saint Bonaventure: 2005), xiv–xxii.

[74] *The Sunday Sermons of St. Bonaventure*, ed. Timothy Johnson, WSB 12.

[75] *Epist.* 1 (WSB 5, 60–61).

[76] Timothy Johnson, "Introduction," WSB 12, 33. See also idem, "The Prothemes of Bonaventure's *Sermones dominicales* and Minorite Prayer," in *Franciscans at Prayer* (Leiden, 2007), 95–122.

[77] For the background of this work, and a translation and notes, see Monti, "Instruction for Novices," WSB 5, 145–175.

private prayer, as well as the Divine Office, which he viewed as the most regular "school of prayer" in the life of his brothers.[78]

This calls to mind another dimension of Bonaventure's pastoral care: the great attention he devoted to the liturgical worship of his brotherhood. He worked hard to complete the renewal of the order's liturgical books that had been undertaken by Haymo of Faversham and continued by John of Parma.[79] Bonaventure was intensely interested in this ongoing project: every chapter he held devoted attention to some facet of the order's liturgical life, as the worship of the brotherhood was a key means of maintaining its unity. At chapters, various new service books were presented for approval, which the delegates would take back to their provinces to be copied and utilized. Succeeding chapters would bring back comments and criticism so that necessary emendations could be made. Bonaventure circulated the texts of a revised breviary and missal at the Chapter of Narbonne,[80] at which time a number of minor changes were introduced; the following chapter of Pisa in 1263 enacted a considerable number of revisions to the order's liturgical books.[81] Lesser revisions were introduced at the chapters of 1266, 1269, and 1272.

A key element of the community's common prayer was the *legenda* of St Francis that was employed in the annual solemn liturgical celebration of his feast lasting an entire week. When Bonaventure became minister general, there were three such official legends of Francis, all by Thomas of Celano: the *Life of St. Francis*, published in 1229 and distributed at the general chapter of 1230; the "second life," or *Remembrance of the Desire of the Soul*, presented to the chapter of 1247; and the *Treatise on the Miracles of St Francis*, completed in 1252 and presented to the Chapter of Metz in 1254. All of these were in circulation, and in a sense they presented alternate readings of the life and values of the founder. Therefore, the Chapter of Rome in 1257 had decreed that "one good legend of St Francis be compiled

---

[78] See Timothy Johnson, *Iste Pauper Clamavit*: *Saint Bonaventure's Mendicant Theology of Prayer* (New York: 1990), 139–145.

[79] The classic study of these developments is S.J.P. van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* (Westminster, Md.: 1960). Haymo had issued a revised Missal for private Masses in 1243; the following year he drew up a complete ordinal for the choral Liturgy of the Hours, sung conventual Mass, and table prayers, which was officially promulgated after his death at either the chapter of 1247 or 1251. For details, see Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 292–354.

[80] "Statutes Issued by the Chapter of Narbonne" 2, WSB 5, 138.

[81] "Statutes Issued by the Chapter of Pisa," WSB 5, 177–188.

from all those already in existence."[82] The reasons for this injunction were several: the prolixity and dissonant images of the founder in the existing legends; the desire to emphasize the divine guidance of the founder; and conforming to new official standards of sanctity, which emphasized a continual life of holiness rather than dramatic conversion.[83]

In any case, Bonaventure complied with this directive by composing two legends for use during the octave of St Francis, which he presented to the chapter of 1263: the *Major Life*, intended for reading in the refectory, and the *Minor Life*, designed for the shorter readings in the office of Matins. At a time of internal crisis in the order about its foundational values, Bonaventure believed it was essential to achieve a unified portrait of its founder. His elegant treatment organizes incidents from Francis's life thematically, in terms of the threefold pseudo-Dionysian mystic way of purification, illumination, and union. In the process, however, everything in Francis' life that was embarrassing or controversial was eliminated; he is reconceived, not as the leader of the primitive brotherhood, but as a model of virtue for the clericalized, pastorally engaged friars of Bonaventure's own generation. Merlo is accurate when he says Bonaventure "chose to downgrade" the importance of maintaining a link with the way of life of the primitive brotherhood, which thus became "demythologized."[84] Instead, with connections made to the new general constitutions, Bonaventure's Francis was intended to mold his contemporary confreres for their life and ministry.[85]

---

[82] Most modern studies state that this order was given by the Chapter of Narbonne in 1260. However, no such decree is found in the authentic acts of this chapter. Van Dijk's critical edition of the liturgical statutes of the order concludes that it was in fact issued by the chapter of Rome in 1257: *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy* (Leiden: 1963), 2, 417. Théophile Desbonnets's discussion of the sources, *From Intuition to Institution*, trans. Paul Duggan and Jerry Du Charme (Chicago: 1988) also follows this opinion (157). For more detail, see Dominic Monti, "Statutes Issued by the Chapter of Narbonne (1260)," WSB 5, 137. It appears that Bonaventure was already interviewing companions of St Francis during the summer of 1259.

[83] For the same motives, the general chapter of the Dominicans, who did not experience the same internal tensions as the Franciscans, also asked that a new life of St Dominic be drawn up; the master general, Humbert of Romans, complied and presented it to the chapter of 1256. See Edward T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth Century Society* (Toronto: 1984), 92–96. This last factor was already evident at the Chapter of Narbonne, where an antiphon used in the office of St Francis was altered to eliminate a reference to his earlier sinful life: *Stat. Narb.* 21 (WSB 5, 142).

[84] Merlo, *In the Name of St. Francis*, 207.

[85] See Jacques Dalarun, *The Misadventure of Francis of Assisi*, trans. Edward Hagman (Saint. Bonaventure: 2002), 221–258, and the essay by Jay Hammond in this volume.

Relationship to Papacy

A good deal of Bonaventure's efforts as minister general was external—representing his brotherhood to the wider church. Especially during these years of controversy, when its very right to exist was being questioned, it was imperative that the minister general be a person of both determination and great tact. Bonaventure filled this description admirably. He managed to be on excellent terms with all of the popes during his administration,[86] and thus he was able to maintain the privileges which earlier pontiffs had conceded to the order and even expand them.

Alexander IV, as mentioned above, had revoked in December 1254 the severe restrictions placed on the activities of the mendicant orders by Innocent IV the previous month. Bonaventure was not content with this measure; he pressed Alexander, formerly cardinal protector of the order, to issue a comprehensive statement of the rights of the order. And so, in 1258, the Pope granted the bull *Virtute conspicuos*, quickly dubbed "Mare magnum," because it gathered, listed and confirmed, one after the other, the main privileges granted to the Lesser Brothers since their foundation.[87] These were then reissued by Urban IV in 1262[88] and by Clement IV in 1265, who added even more privileges.[89] In fact, Clement granted the friars almost total exemption from the local hierarchy, not only in their internal life but also in the exercise of their ministry.

One privilege particularly galling for the secular clergy was the friars' right to hear the confessions of the laity without first receiving the permission of their parish priest; Clement's decree even undercut the rights of bishops themselves, for it stated that a friar could receive such faculties directly from the pope or his legate. The bishops of the province of Rheims, meeting in synod late in 1267, responded by severely restricting the number of friars to whom they would give faculties for public preaching and hearing confessions. Bonaventure traveled to Rome the next spring to appeal to the Pope, who reaffirmed his support of the order.[90] As

---

[86] These were Alexander IV (1254–61); Urban IV (1261–64); Clement IV (1265–68); and Gregory X (1271–76). There was an almost three-year interregnum between the death of Clement IV and the election of Gregory X.

[87] *Virtute conspicuos* (2 August 1258), *Bullarium Franciscanum* 1, 298–303.

[88] *Cum a nobis* (29 May 1262), *Bullarium Franciscanum* 2, 446.

[89] *Virtute conspicuos* (21 July 1265), *Bullarium Franciscanum* 3, 19–24.

[90] *Ordinis Vestri*, July 1268 (*Bullarium Franciscanum* 3, 162, n. 177). This reserved the right to interpret doubtful privileges of the order to the Holy See, not to the judgment of individual bishops or local councils.

a result, the papal legate to France, Simon of Brion, annulled the synod's offending statutes in December.[91]

These tensions sparked a reopening of theological debate on the academic front at the University of Paris during the winter of 1269, with the secular master Gerard of Abbeville attacking the ecclesial status of the mendicant orders; in the summer he issued a lengthy treatise, *Contra adversarium*, against the friars, to which Bonaventure responded with his great *Apologia pauperum* in the fall of that year. Gerard had revived the arguments advanced by William of Saint-Amour in the earlier phase of the conflict, but now bolstered his case by arguing that the ownership of property in fact facilitated the church's mission by the hierarchy, and therefore should therefore be the standard for all Christians. In reply, Bonaventure argued that the highest degree of evangelical perfection, the aim of the Lesser Brothers, is based on a radical imitation of the self-emptying Christ. Therefore "the profession that freely vows to follow Christ in extreme poverty most fittingly calls for renunciation of dominion over anything whatsoever and must be content with the limited use of things belonging to others and conceded to it."[92] Bonaventure, as we have seen, tried to foster such "limited use" by the friars through his legislation on buildings, clothing, and utensils. His exposition of the distinction between *dominion* and *use* became central to the self-understanding of the Minorite order and within a few years was adopted as official church doctrine.[93]

One factor which made the friars' position somewhat tenuous at the time was their lack of a strong advocate in the papacy. Clement had died the preceding November, and the Holy See remained vacant due to two polarized blocks within the college of cardinals. Needless to say, Bonaventure feared the election of a pope who would be less sympathetic to the friars. The chapter of 1269, therefore, passed decrees urging the friars to tone down their claims and seek accommodation.[94]

---

[91] See H. Lippens, "La lettre de Simon de Brion en faveur des mendiants," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 29 (1936): 79–97.

[92] *Apol. Paup.* 11.5 (8, 312): Verum enim professioni, quae sponte devovit Christo in extrema paupertatis sectari, concedens fuit universaliter rerum abdicare dominium arctoque rerum alienarum et sibi concessarum usu esse contentam." Trans. Jose de Vinck and Robert Karris, *Defense of the Mendicants*, WSB 15, 307–308.

[93] By Nicholas IV, *Exiit Qui Seminat* (1279). For a good brief treatment of Bonaventure's teaching on poverty, see Malcolm Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 2nd ed. (Saint Bonaventure: 1998), 133–148.

[94] Giuseppe Abate, "Diffinitio capituli celebrati Assisii anno Domini MCCLXIX," *Miscellanea francescana* 35 (1935): 235–36. English trans., WSB 5, 239–243.

Meanwhile, the cardinals remained deadlocked in Viterbo. Like many other leaders of the time, Bonaventure strove to use his good offices to suggest a way out of this frustrating and scandalous situation. It is striking testimony to the esteem in which he was held by his contemporaries that several stories arose about his playing a pivotal role in overcoming the impasse. It would appear most likely that in 1271, Bonaventure proposed to the cardinals the method they eventually used to overcome the deadlock, namely, that they "compromise" by entrusting the election to a smaller committee.[95] In any event, the outsider selected as the new pontiff, Teobaldo Visconti, who took the name Gregory X, knew and respected Bonaventure from his student days in Paris, and was a great admirer of the mendicant orders. Once again, the Friars Minor were fortunate in to have a pope as a strong ally.

Gregory quickly announced his intentions to summon a general church council to reinvigorate crusading efforts, achieve reunion with the Eastern churches, and further implement the work of ecclesial reform in the West. To achieve these aims, he asked Bonaventure to select friars to head an embassy to Constantinople; early in 1273 he selected Lyons as the site for the council to meet the following year. At the same time, he created a number of new cardinals to work closely with him on this vast project. One of these was Bonaventure, who was created cardinal bishop of Albano.

Despite the fact that Bonaventure and his Dominican colleague, Peter of Tarentaise, were the chief advisors of the pope in planning the council, a good deal of the agenda items submitted by bishops concerned the role of the mendicant orders in the life and ministry of the church. The anti-mendicant party among the episcopate was intent on curbing their privileges, especially since the situation had been aggravated by the proliferation of even more mendicant groups in the past two decades. Gregory clearly had no intention of giving in to these critics; yet, at the same time, their apparent strength when the council opened gave him and his mendicant advisors cause for alarm. Strong preemptive action was necessary:

---

[95] The most widely circulated of these stories—still repeated—is that it was Bonaventure who suggested to the podesta of Viterbo that he lock the cardinals into a chamber of the papal palace until they reached a decision, eventually going to the extent of removing the roof over them! This is untrue: Bonaventure was not even in Italy at the time. The mode of election by compromise was in the Narbonne constitutions, 9.6. See Antonio Franchi, "Analisi storiografica del ruolo di Bonaventura al conclave di Viterbo (1268–71)," *Doctor Seraphicus* 28 (1981): 65–77.

the general chapter of the Lesser Brothers, in session simultaneously with the council, would have to move quickly to stave off criticism.

The Pope himself presided at their chapter, whose first order of business was to select a successor to Bonaventure. The unanimous choice, Jerome of Ascoli, leader of the papal delegation to Constantinople, was still en route with the Greek envoys. Apparently delegated by the Pope to preside over the remaining sessions of the chapter, Bonaventure guided the assembly to enact decrees that attempted to hold a strict line in regards to the interpretation of poverty and to display a conciliatory attitude toward bishops. In addition, a commission of Dominicans and Franciscans, headed by Bonaventure and Peter of Tarentaise, drew up a ten-point program, consisting largely of concessions on the friars' part, designed to ease tensions between themselves and the secular clergy. Bonaventure's strategy was a successful one; by the time of the final formulation of the decree on mendicants at the Council's final session on 17 July, opposition to the Dominicans and Franciscans had been deflected, although the more recent mendicant orders were severely affected by the Council's decisions.

Not all of Bonaventure's dealings with outsiders were with adversaries. The general minister was responsible for cultivating good relations with supporters of the order. For example, Bonaventure maintained for years a close relationship with Louis IX of France[96] and was also attentive in corresponding with other benefactors, thanking them for their generosity, often incorporating them into the "family" of the order through letters of affiliation.[97]

Poor Clares

Furthermore, Bonaventure had to monitor the relationship of the friars toward the Poor Ladies and to the Brothers and Sisters of Penance, No authentic document of Bonaventure's administration remains to testify to his relationship to the penitents, although we do know the friars were very active in ministering to them during these years.[98] With the Clares,

[96] Jacques Guy Bougerol, "Saint Bonaventure et le Roi Saint Louis," *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974* (Grottaferrata: 1974).

[97] For example, see "A Letter to the Count and Countess of Flanders," WSB 5, 63–65.

[98] A disparaging reference to the penitential movement in the pseudo-Bonaventuran *Determinationes Quaestionum*, published in the Quaracchi edition, has often been cited as embodying Bonaventure's attitude (8, 367–68). On the other hand, his letters to lay

however, four letters have come down to us attesting that they occupied a considerable part of Bonaventure's attention. The care of communities of religious women was a vexing problem for orders of men in the Middle Ages, and the Minorites were no exception. There was a great tension between the sisters and those friars who wished to foster a close relationship with them on the one hand, and on the other, a considerable number of friars who looked on the pastoral care of the sisters as a burden. Although Francis certainly had a great bond with Clare and her sisters at San Damiano and a few other houses associated with it, the problem arose when Gregory IX associated those communities with his own congregation of "Poor Cloistered Nuns" and made the friars responsible for the care of the entire confederation.[99] Small communities of friars were attached to the monasteries of the sisters to provide for their needs, including assisting in begging alms for their support.

But as more and more monasteries of the Damianite movement were founded, it meant that ever greater numbers of friars were tied down in ministering to them. The brothers grew increasingly restive under these demands; by the mid-1240s, the minister general, Crescentius of Jesi, was petitioning Innocent IV to release the order from its obligations. The Pope, however, had other ideas: to his mind there should be even closer links between the two groups, and in 1247 he issued a new rule for the Damianites, virtually aggregating them to the Friars Minor. The sisters would now be subject to the provincial ministers of the friars, who would designate visitors to the monasteries and provide all spiritual services. Although sentiment among the friars was by now largely in favor of relinquishing any responsibility for the nuns, they realistically had little hope for change as Alexander IV, who still was Protector of the oder, was very devoted to them.[100]

---

confraternities show him to have been supportive of these groups (see Letter to the Canons of Kaiserwerth, WSB 5, 245–46). For their connection to the friars during these years, see Servus Gieben, "Confraternite e penitenti dell'area francescana," *Francescanesimo e vita religiosa* (1981), 171–201.

[99] This move in the late 1220s subjected the Poor Sisters of San Damiano to the form of life he had drawn up in 1219 rather than the form of life composed for them by Francis. It was in December 1227 that he made the friars responsible for the pastoral care of the confederation, which he named "The Order of San Damiano" once that monastery joined it in 1228. For these developments, see Lezlie S. Knox, *Creating Clare of Assisi: Female Franciscan Identities in Later Medieval Italy* (Leiden: 2008), 19–37.

[100] As protector, he had approved Clare's Rule and as Pope, he canonized her in 1255. For this period, see Knox, 37–55.

Bonaventure's own relation to the order of San Damiano was complex. While in Paris, he became well acquainted with Isabelle, sister of Louis IX, and her new foundation of Longchamp, affiliated to the Friars Minor, and addressed a treatise, *On the Perfection of Life*, to Franciscan religious women, yet his Constitutions of Narbonne played down any responsibility of his order to the nuns. "Although Bonaventure respected the sisters' spiritual life, as Minister General he appeared unwilling to encourage the brothers to deepen their relationship with women or to create a space for them within the Franciscan Order."[101]

The situation between the friars and the sisters erupted into open conflict after Alexander's death in 1261. Since the friars were no longer under pressure to care for the nuns, they began to withdraw their pastoral care; the affected nuns began launching suits against the friars to hold them responsible. Besieged by both sides, Urban IV sought a compromise. A committee was formed, headed by Bonaventure, to work out a comprehensive solution. The Pope issued a new Rule for the nuns, now called the Order of St. Clare, which released the friars from all obligation to provide pastoral care; Bonaventure named visitors for the nuns, who would urge them to accept the new Urbanist Rule, but assured the sisters that the friars would continue to render their services "not out of duty, but out of generosity." The sisters were clearly no longer partners of the brothers in living a common evangelical life, but the objects of their pastoral care.[102]

Conclusion

After this survey, how does one assess the impact of Bonaventure's seventeen years as minister general? Jacques Dalarun strikes a wise balance when he says, "all things considered, the legislative labor of Bonaventure (. . .) must be neither exaggerated nor underestimated."[103] Certainly, we cannot consider Bonaventure as "the second founder of the Order" whose "generalate marked a turning point" in its history. Bonaventure did not "set the friars on the road they were henceforth to travel;"[104] they

---

[101] See Knox, 57–69 (quotation, 69).

[102] For documentation, see "Two Letters on the Friars' Relations with the Poor Clares," WSB 5, 189–198.

[103] Jacques Dalarun, *Francis of Assisi and Power* (St. Bonaventure: 2007), 157.

[104] Moorman, 154.

were already well down that road when he joined the order in 1243. Bonaventure did not set the new directions; he was a product of them. If anyone can claim the title of "second founder" of the Friars Minor, it would be Haymo of Faversham, who was the main figure behind the clerical "coup" of 1239 and leader of the "reformation" of the order that took place in the early 1240s. But on the other hand, it is not enough to say with Salimbene that Bonaventure was a capable man who "ruled for seventeen years and did many good works."[105] Bonaventure did not simply follow in the footsteps of his predecessors. Rather, his brilliant systematic mind was able to produce a remarkable synthesis of the fundamental documents of the order: its legislation, the life of its founder, its patterns of worship and initial formation, as well as a thoroughly articulated theology of its role in the church and Christian society.[106] All of these were placed in the context of the clericalized, pastorally-oriented order he had joined and to which he was fully committed. Although Bonaventure did not set the direction the Friars Minor were henceforth to follow, he provided them with a rationale for their journey and a clear map for the road.

[105] *Chronicle*, 309.

[106] In Giovanni Miccoli's words, Bonaventure played a critical part in a "rifondazione dell'ordine e del suo modello in termini e modi di essere che potevano finalmente rientrare pienamente nel quadro istituzionale e di spiritualità, nei modi di presenza e di organizzazione, coi quali da secoli ormai si era manifestato l'insegnamento e il messaggio cristiano nella società europea occidentale": *Francesco d'Assisi. Realtà e memoria di un'experienza Cristiana* (Turin: 1991), 300.

INDEX

a Fanna, Fidelis, 59, 66, 410, 414
Abraham, 292, 307
Adam, 48, 55, 158, 264, 269 n. 74, 275, 280–81, 315, 337 n. 17, 342–43, 345, 356
Adolph, Carl, 66
Aeterni Patris, 161, 162 n. 137
Aeviternity, 305
Affection (*affectus*), 55, 118, 134, 229, 313, 315, 317, 368, 371, 383, 428
Albert of Pisa, 546
Albert the Great, 12, 55 n. 121, 82, 100 n. 76, 194
Alexander IV, 18, 26, 466 n. 70, 467, 470, 474, 500, 552, 557, 571, 575–76
Alexander of Hales, 11–12, 15, 55, 58 n. 131, 89–90, 94, 105, 131 n. 27, 182, 194, 196–200, 205, 252 n. 12, 305 n. 38, 306, 308, 333, 334 n. 8, 340 n. 33, 361, 365 n. 16, 441, 547
Algazel, 318
Allegorical Sense, 110–11, 177, 324, 415–16
Alms, 20, 22, 468, 475 n. 115, 478, 505, 522–23, 529, 539, 549, 552, 575
Ambrose, 12, 183, 493 n. 205, 517, 528, 538
Anagogical Sense, 111, 177, 294, 330, 416
Anaxagoras, 157
Andrew (Apostle), 416–17
Andrew of Saint Victor, 167, 171
Angel of the Sixth Seal, 30–31, 328–29, 444, 471, 502, 514, 541, 551
Angelo of Clareno, 509–10
Annunciation, 44–45, 261, 268–69, 280, 311, 323, 427
Anselm of Canterbury, 12, 42, 97, 107 n. 107, 112, 116, 118, 141, 151–52, 167, 194–95, 198, 264–66, 269, 280, 538
Anselm of Loan, 171
Anthropology, 13, 22, 25, 37, 227, 303
Apocalypticism, 298, 327–232, 444, 466, 470–72, 490 n. 186, 514, 521–22, 541, 550–51
Apologia pauperum [*Apol. Paup.*] (Apology for the Poor), 46, 48, 56, 70, 510, 515, 523, 526–28, 532, 537–39, 572
Apostle(s), 19, 22, 47–48, 50, 53 n. 114, 133, 174–75, 344–47, 382, 416, 421, 427, 433, 467–68, 475 n. 119, 521, 526, 528–29, 531
Apostolic ministry, 16–17, 298–99, 505, 522, 533, 544, 548, 554, 560
Appropriations, 116 n. 153, 200, 239–40, 243, 262–63
Argument *ex convenientia*, 107, 116, 120
Argument *ex pietate*, 107, 117–18
Aristotelianism, 49, 52, 88–89, 93–94, 98, 100, 126–27, 130, 158, 189, 194, 197–98, 296, 308, 311, 314, 317, 368, 394, 422, 519
Aristotle, 50–51, 88–89, 94, 125–27, 130, 133–34, 139, 146–49, 153–54, 157–58, 183–84, 200, 217, 236, 294, 304, 308–09, 312, 318, 411, 423
artes liberals, 10
artes predicandi, 405
Ascension, 45, 256, 258, 260, 282–83, 346–47, 413
Ascent, 33, 89, 98–100, 124, 174, 203, 283, 285, 290, 302, 322, 372, 378–79, 390–91, 432, 442–43, 445, 487, 494, 517, 541
Assumption, 45, 298
Augustine of Hippo, 11, 13, 34, 41, 110, 126, 131–33, 137–38, 146, 149–50, 153–54, 160, 162, 168, 176, 179, 186, 189–91, 194–97, 202, 210, 214, 218, 220, 293, 304–05, 308, 312, 319, 327, 374, 517–18, 520, 528, 533, 538, 558
Augustinianism, 42, 50, 102, 104, 138, 193, 195–97, 200, 207, 210–11, 218, 235, 243, 306, 311, 375
Authority, 10, 16, 57, 96, 105–06, 112, 117, 121, 123, 126–30, 132, 152, 172, 174, 178, 182–83, 186, 235–36, 294, 320–21, 328, 344, 351, 353, 388 n. 105, 409, 416, 426–27, 437, 488, 490, 494, 517, 522–23, 525, 529–30, 532, 536–38, 550, 552, 554–57
Averroes (Averroism), 50, 422–23, 428
Avicebron, 308–09
Avicenna, 50, 154, 318

Baptism, 9, 31, 325, 334 n. 8, 342, 347, 349–50, 352–56
Beatific Vision, 37, 53, 134, 158, 160, 296
Beatitude, 174, 195 n. 29, 207, 240, 278, 316, 323
Beatitudes, 106–07, 428
Bede the Venerable, 167, 183

Begging, 478, 520, 564
Beguines, 297
Bernard of Clairvaux, 12, 34, 41–42, 56, 112, 128–29, 134, 158, 169, 295, 297–98, 319, 322, 517
Bernard, Brother, 476
Bernardine of Siena, 61
Birth, 44–45, 225, 268 n. 70, 325, 415, 464–65, 491
Blanco, Chavero, 74
Body of Christ, 273, 283, 301, 349, 532
Boethius, 195 n. 29, 308
Bond (*nexus*), 90 n. 31, 230–31, 233–34, 375, 381
Bonelli, Benedict, 58, 65–67, 72–73, 180
Bonum diffusivum sui est, 198, 380
Bougerol, Jacques Guy, 11–12, 45–46, 74, 154, 363, 403, 405, 410, 413–14, 417–18, 422, 433, 445, 523
Brady, Ignatius, 21, 32, 45, 74, 414, 418
Breviloquium [*Brev.*], 24–25, 68, 81–82, 84–87, 89–92, 98, 110, 113, 117, 131, 172–73, 176, 201, 213, 223, 247–86, 295, 301, 303, 333, 336, 353–54, 357, 370, 424, 427, 567
Brooke, Rosalind, 559
Burr, David, 512–13, 540

Canonization of Bonaventure, 9, 32, 34, 55, 509
Canonization of Francis, 21, 440, 458 n. 27, 484, 487
Carpenter, Charles, 361–62, 364–65, 371, 384 n. 90, 400
Carruthers, Mary, 419
Catalogus XV Generalium, 455
Catalogus XXIV Generalium, 455
Celestial orbs, 304, 318
Cenci, Cesare, 559
Ceremonial, 458
Certitude, 91–92, 96, 114, 143–46, 148–50, 152, 154, 163, 178, 377, 428
Chapter of Arles (1224), 493
Chapter of Narbonne (1260), 29, 32, 447, 454–55, 457, 459, 506 n. 273, 510, 558–59, 561–63, 566, 568–69, 570 n. 82, 576
Chapter of Paris (1266), 29, 46, 439, 448, 453, 504 n. 269, 562–63
Chapter of Pisa (1263), 446, 456, 562, 566, 569
Chapter of Rome (1257), 446, 454–55, 456–59, 562
Charity (*caritas*), 37, 48, 134, 136, 145, 192, 195 nn. 28–29, 196, 197 n. 36, 198 n. 40, 199, n. 44, 207, 228, 240, 276, 282–83, 334 n. 8, 380, 399, 475 n. 115, 485, 498, 501–02, 530
Chastity, 297, 428, 472–73, 518, 531
Chenu, Marie-Dominique, 319
Cherubim, 285, 301–02, 319, 321–22, 331, 379, 382
Choice, 29, 147, 269–70, 279, 291, 306, 312, 414, 326, 375
Choir, 290, 292–93, 298, 391, 435–51, 458–59, 462
Christianity, 18, 48–49, 51–52, 119, 121, 126, 134, 140–43, 154, 170, 162, 189, 190 n. 4, 256, 261, 287, 289–92, 300, 307, 317, 326, 363, 368, 424, 427, 527, 544, 476, 492, 504, 516, 527, 572
Church, 15–18, 21–22, 31, 38, 42, 47–49, 52–55, 58, 61–62, 84, 93, 108, 111, 115, 129, 159, 174–75, 177, 238, 260, 273, 282–83, 287, 289–92, 298–99, 312, 315, 318–19, 324, 326–32, 343–44, 346, 350–52, 355–57, 362, 378, 408–09, 411–12, 414, 423, 428–30, 432–34, 437, 441–44, 463, 470 n. 89, 471 n. 98, 472, 474, 481, 489, 490 n. 183, 503–04, 512, 514, 517–18, 520–22, 525–27, 529, 531–32, 534–35, 537–41, 543–51, 553, 558, 561, 563, 566–67, 571–73, 577
Church Fathers, 10–13, 41, 112, 118, 126–27, 129, 131–32, 293, 312
Cistercians, 32, 411, 455 n. 14, 459 n. 36
Clare of Assisi, 39–41, 414, 479, 491, 500, 566, 575
Clasen, Sophronius, 32, 418
Clement IV, 526, 571–72
Cognition, 14 n. 13, 22, 87, 98 n. 67, 133–35, 138, 146–48, 150, 156, 191, 225, 295, 386
Collationes de decem praeceptis [*De dec. praec.*] (Collations on the Ten Commandments), 46, 370, 403–04, 421–25, 427
Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti [*De don. Spir.*] (Collations on the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit), 46–48, 68, 76, 92, 97, 370, 421–22, 424
Collationes in Evangelium Ioannis [*Coll. Jn.*] (Collations on the Gospel of John), 24, 69, 73, 186–87
Collationes in Hexaemeron [*Hex.*] (Collations in Hexaemeron), 11, 27–28, 46, 49, 52–54, 68, 75, 77, 81–82, 89, 92, 98, 100, 102–03, 105, 108–10, 127, 158, 202, 208, 227, 249, 302, 308, 316, 322, 327, 329–30, 366, 370, 383, 387–88, 394, 404, 421–24, 429–30, 432, 445, 510, 517, 532, 540

Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis [*Comm. Jn.*] (Commentary on John's Gospel), 68
Commentarius in Evangelium Lucae [*Comm. Luc.*] (Commentry on Luke's Gospel), 19, 69, 174, 179, 181, 420
Commentarius in librum Ecclesiastes [*Comm. Ecc.*] (Commentary on Ecclesiastes), 19, 181, 183–85
Commentarius in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi [I, II, III, IV Sent.] (Sentence Commentary), 12–13, 27, 50, 62–63, 67, 72, 76, 81–82, 85–87, 89, 92–93, 96–97, 99–101, 104–05, 113, 121, 126, 130–33, 146–47, 156–57, 169–70, 172–73, 181, 197, 200–01, 207–08, 213, 223–24, 226, 228, 249, 253, 295–96, 303, 307–08, 310, 314, 320, 324, 333–36, 345, 349, 353–54, 357, 364, 366–68, 370, 375, 382, 386, 440, 515
Compassion, 43, 45, 386, 390, 416, 419, 445, 475 n. 115, 520, 529
Condescension, 439, 528, 530–32, 540
Confession, 16, 301, 344–45, 423, 434, 440, 463, 468, 474, 479, 509, 511, 525, 545–47, 550, 552 n. 26, 560, 561 n. 55, 562 n. 58, 571
Confirmation, 306, 314, 316, 334 n. 8, 342, 345–48, 352, 354–56
Conformity, 94 n. 45, 107, 203–05, 219, 223, 227, 243, 267, 272, 278, 369, 373–74, 377–79, 387, 389, 402, 408, 438, 443, 464–65, 468, 471 n. 95, 475 n. 119, 483, 486, 497–98, 502–03, 505, 507, 517, 528–29, 570
Congruity (*Congruitas*), 116 n. 154, 118, 208, 305, 334, 339–41, 376
Conscience, 38, 154, 300, 479, 490–91, 524
Constitutiones Generales Narbonenses [*Const. Narb.*] (Constitutions of Narbonne), 29, 70, 73, 77, 460, 510
Constitutions, 455, 457, 459, 554–55, 57–64, 568, 570, 576
Contemplation (*contemplatio*), 17, 22, 28, 34–38, 44, 52–53, 87 n. 22, 112 n. 136, 134, 138, 142, 203, 242, 274, 285–87, 298–99, 302–03, 305, 316, 319, 327, 329–31, 362, 366, 369–71, 374, 376, 379, 382–83, 387, 391, 398–401, 411, 415–16, 420–21, 426, 430–32, 436–38, 441–42, 444–45, 449, 475 n. 115, 497 n. 227, 501–02, 514, 535, 541, 547, 550, 568
Contuition (*contuitio*), 150, 369, 391, 392 n. 115, 470 n. 88
Corporeal, 157, 295, 304–05, 309–10, 314, 317, 385, 552
Council of Lyon II (1274), 53–54, 202 n. 54, 333 n. 5, 357, 412, 423, 430, 432–33, 441, 543, 567, 573
Council of Trent, 357
Cousins, Ewert, 119, 250, 394
Creatio ex nihilo, 157, 304, 359
Creation, 13, 14 n. 13, 23, 25, 33, 37, 42, 52–53–53, 81–82, 83 n. 4, 91–92, 98, 99 n. 71, 104 n. 86, 108, 111, 113, 115, 117–18, 131, 135, 137, 154, 157–58, 175, 198 n. 39, 202, 204 n. 58, 209, 216, 222, 224, 226–27, 232, 234, 236–37, 242–44, 248, 249 n. 5, 251, 254–58, 262–65, 269, 271, 277, 279, 282, 284, 295–96, 301, 303–06, 310, 312–17, 319–20, 327, 335 n. 12, 336–37, 341, 343, 355–56, 364–65, 369, 372–77, 379, 381–82, 385–86, 388–92, 394–96, 399–402, 404, 415, 430–32, 489, 516, 531, 533, 539–41
Crucifixion, 30–31, 33–34, 38, 43, 45, 92–93, 114 n. 146, 179, 279–80, 284–86, 353–54, 362–63, 370–72, 379, 382, 384–90, 396–98, 400–01, 427, 443, 445, 450, 473, 475 n. 115, 496–99, 501–02, 521

Dalarun, Jacques, 509–11, 555, 576
Damascene, John, 12, 198
Damned, 306
Daniel, 311
Daniel, Randolph, 32, 108
Dante Alighieri, 511–12
De anima, 147
Decent, 176, 238, 282, 305–06, 322, 368, 386, 390, 432, 442–43, 445, 532
De perfectione vitae ad sorores [*Perf. vit. sor.*] (On the Perfection of Life), 40, 42, 56, 69, 567, 576
De reductione artium ad theologiam [Red. art.] (On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology), 12, 68, 81–82, 102–03, 113, 137, 176
De Regnon, Theodore, 193–94, 200
De sex alis Seraphim [*Sex Ser.*] (Six Wings of the Seraph), 69, 78, 322, 329
De triplici via [*Trip. Via*] (Triple Way), 34–37, 69, 79, 285, 370, 484
Decalogue, 424–27, 482, n. 152, 494
Delorme, Ferdinand, 32, 429, 447, 523
Demons, 419, 425
Demonstration, 85, 95–96, 97 n. 62, 113 n. 143, 116–17, 145, 328, 502–03

Devotion, 117–18, 178, 182, 290 n. 2, 298–99, 301, 303, 311–13, 329, 371, 390–91, 416, 453, 475 n. 115, 477 n. 133, 503
Dilatatio, 406
Disputatio, 19, 23, 27, 47, 132, 161, 169, 201, 297, 403 n. 1, 520–21
Distelbrink, Balduinus, 74
Divine sweetness, 44, 134, 142
Doctor of the Church, 58, 62, 84, 156, 528
Doctors, 9–10, 14, 16, 19–20, 22, 110–112, 171–72, 406, 409, 477, 525, 548
Dominic Guzman, 17, 21, 30–31, 168, 438, 447, 448 n. 69, 449, 458 n. 32, 520–21, 545, 570 n. 83
Dominicans, 14 n. 15, 15, 18, 39, 49, 62, 80 n. 73, 171, 185, 298, 328, 331, 410, 434, 438, 447, 455 n. 14, 457, 458 n. 32, 466 n. 69, 467 n. 70, 470, 475, 492 n. 198, 515, 523–24, 535 n. 43, 546–47, 550–51, 552 n. 27, 555, 558, 558 n. 45, 570 n. 83, 573–74
Donneaud, Henri, 95

Efficient Cause, 91, 104, 113–14, 148, 243, 368
Egan, Harvey, 363
Elijah, 30–31, 471, 490
Elisha, 31, 465 n. 67, 490
Emanation, 98, 100, 151, 190–91, 203–04, 206–07, 210, 212, 214, 216–18, 220, 222, 226–27–38, 240–43, 303, 368, 373, 395, 400, 431
Empyrean heaven, 304–05, 317
Epistemology, 22, 50, 82, 146, 202, 313, 315
Epistola [*Epist.*] (Letters), 70, 563
Epistola de tribus quaestionibus ad magistrum innominatum [*Tri. quaes. mag.*] (On Three Questions to an Unknown Master), 75, 408, 475, 477, 510, 520, 523–24, 547, 550, 553
Essence, 110, 116, 129, 149, 157, 208–09, 211, 218, 229, 234, 237, 296, 302, 308, 312, 314, 377, 379, 382, 395
Eternal Gospel (*Evangelium aeternum*), 17, 26, 470–72, 474, 514–15, 551
Eternity, 22, 51–53, 101, 113, 115, 133–34, 139, 149, 150 n. 94, 151, 174, 176–77, 183–84, 209, 215, 217, 222, 227, 230, 235, 237–38, 240–43, 254, 258, 274, 276–77, 287, 305, 322, 327, 330, 355, 366, 374–75, 377–78, 381–82, 394, 396, 399, 413, 416, 423, 465, 531, 551
Eucharist, 24, 54, 291, 334 n. 8, 335, 348–50, 352–56, 422, 425, 438, 498 n. 235, 531
Evangelical Perfection, 49, 464–65, 468, 470–73, 487, 500–03, 505, 510, 512–13, 515–19, 522, 525, 527–28, 531–33, 539–41, 572
Eve, 48, 268, 315, 432
Evil, 37, 48, 107, 278 n. 118, 304–07, 312, 314, 477, 529–30, 533–34, 564 n. 67
Exegesis, 24, 63, 68–69, 72, 128, 167–70, 178–79, 183–86, 290, 293, 296, 303, 323–24, 413, 526–27, 535
Exemplarism, 51, 91–92, 103, 113–115, 139, 150–52, 204, 220–21, 225–26, 232, 236, 240, 243, 244 n. 219, 298, 329, 365, 368, 370, 376–78, 381, 385–86, 388, 392 n. 115, 394–96, 400, 417, 420, 431, 459–60, 465, 473, 487, 527, 530–31
Existence, 22, 43, 86, 88, 113, 119, 121, 149, 190, 193, 196, 198, 205, 210, 216, 218–19, 223, 240–42, 245, 274, 296, 299, 304, 310, 316, 325, 332, 363, 466, 505, 539, 544, 548, 570
Exitus-reditus, 100, 114, 214, 223
Extreme Unction, 346–48

Faith, 9, 12 nn. 7–8, 22–25, 27–28, 37–38, 51–53, 81, 83, 84, 86–87, 88 n. 24, 91–97, 99, 102, 106, 109–113, 116–118, 121, 123–25, 127, 130, 134, 136, 140–46, 154–57, 159, 161, 163, 173–78, 189–90, 201, 230 n. 180, 241, 244–45, 253, 270, 273, 282–83, 299, 334, n. 8, 340, 342, 364–65, 368, 382, 393, 396, 398–401, 415, 425, 429, 43132, 468 n. 80, 477, 489, 501–03, 531, 535, 545, 547
Fall, the, 156, 158, 243, 256, 260, 268, 270, 280, 295, 305, 307, 340–41, 343
Falque, Emmanuel, 85, 367, 369–70, 396
Father, 34, 42, 44, 92, 103–05, 115 n. 150, 151, 173, 176, 182, 185, 193, 199 n. 44, 205, 209, 212–24, 226–35, 238–43, 256, 267, 269 n. 72, 273, 275 n. 102, 278, 285, 318, 348 n. 67, 353, 356, 375–81, 383–86, 389, 394–96, 406, 413, 416–17, 423, 425, 431, 440, 442, 453, 462 n. 52, 464 n. 63, 471, 489, 493 n. 205, 521, 531–32, 536, 539
Final Cause, 99 n. 72, 100, 113, 145–46, 243, 367–68, 384 n. 91
Fioretti, 299
First Principle (*primum*), 91–93, 109, 117, 124, 139, 151, 153, 189, 203, 215, 236, 240, 242, 266, 268–69, 272, 374
Foreknowledge, 314–315
Forgiveness, 37, 301, 531
Formal Cause, 86 n. 17, 93, 100, 368

Francis Bartoli, 299
Friendship, 36, 264, 292, 408, 468, 475 n. 119, 487, 509
Frugoni, Chiara, 510

Gabriel the Archangel, 269 n. 72, 302, 311, 323–24
Gerard of Abbeville, 47–49, 481, 526–32, 534–38, 572
Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, 16, 329, 470–72, 514–15, 540, 551–52
Gerson, Jean, 57
Gift, 14 n. 13, 41, 48, 53, 55, 87, 96–97, 100 n. 74, 101, 106–08, 118, 134, 136, 140, 142, 158, 193, 204, 216, 228–30, 232 n. 187, 233–36, 240, 242, 253, 256, 258–61, 265, 272–73, 275–77, 283–85, 306, 326, 331, 361, 366, 370–72, 379, 381, 386, 388 n. 105, 392, 400–02, 423–24, 427–28, 459 n. 35, 488, 520, 528, 531–32, 535, 539, 541
Gilbert of Poitiers, 333
Giles, Brother, 455 n. 14, 456
Gilson, Étienne, 103, 141–43, 153–54, 364
Glory, 42–43, 53, 83, 118, 139, 173, 176, 204, 276–77, 283, 292, 306–07, 374, 378, 406, 429, 471 n. 95, 472, 496 n. 222, 529, 531
Gloss, 10, 41, 169, 171–72, 184, 197, 293–94, 300, 343, 282, 519, 533, 535
Gonzalez, Olegario, 195, 200
Good, 24, 29, 37, 45, 48–49, 67, 89, 91–92, 94, 102, 108, 116 n. 153, 124, 140, 152–53, 157, 159, 163, 177, 182, 192, 194 n. 22, 195–99, 202–03, 205–09, 217–19, 221, 225, 228, 232, 240, 242–43, 264, 276–77, 300–01, 306, 311–16, 349, 353, 355–56, 361, 365 n. 16, 366, 372–73, 375, 379–81, 385, 389, 391–92, 395, 407, 434, 446, 454, 457, 465–66, 474–75, 477, 478 n. 137, 479–80, 491, 497, 516–17, 519–20, 522–23, 527, 529–36, 538–39, 565, 569, 573–74, 577
Gothic architecture, 441–43, 445
Grace, 22, 25, 36–37, 44, 52, 55, 56 n. 121, 82, 87, 92 n. 37, 97–98, 101–02, 106–08, 117, 120, 129, 134, 136, 140–43, 158, 161, 163, 174–76, 203–05, 216, 230, 235, 237, 239–40, 251, 253 n. 17, 255–61, 268, 270–76, 282–84, 286–87, 299, 301–02, 304, 306, 314–17, 326, 335–41, 347–48, 353, 355–57, 365–66, 370–71, 373–74, 377–79, 382, 384–87, 390, 392–93, 397–99, 402, 406, 415–16,424, 427–28, 431, 434, 442, 459 n. 34, 470, 471 n. 95, 473 n. 103, 483, 485, 487–89, 499, 507, 524, 531, 539
Gregory IX, 10, 407, 504 n. 269, 523, 536, 545–46, 549, 575
Gregory the Great, 12, 35, 41–42, 168, 195 n. 29, 321, 517, 528
Gregory X, 47 n. 94, 54, 430, 433, 571 n. 86, 573

Habit (*habitus*), 88 n. 27, 99, 105–06, 130, 134–35, 140–42, 144, 273–75, 299, 366, 386, 393, 516–17, 532
Hammond, Jay, 286
Hayes, Zachary, 103, 250, 377, 380, 395–96, 399
Haymo of Faversham, 15, 438, 446, 448, 458, 469, 577
Heraclitus, 148
Heresy, 19, 21, 49, 52, 230 n. 180, 303, 305, 407, 474, 514–15, 520, 544–45, 552
Heteronomous, 122–24, 143–44, 155, 163, 309, 364 n. 11
Hierarchy, 16, 36, 93, 115, 176, 191, 269, 291, 293, 295, 297–98, 300–02, 307, 315, 317–22, 324, 326–27, 329–30, 379, 390, 429, 432, 470 n. 89, 471 n. 95, 486–87, 497 n. 225, 507, 517, 532, 534–35, 537, 539, 555, 571–72
Holiness (*sanctitas*), 20, 27, 36–37, 46, 55, 61, 63, 128, 144, 158–59, 277, 291, 307, 361–63, 366, 388, 393, 433–34, 249, 487, 487 n. 166, 479, 484 n. 158, 488–89, 491, 534, 570
Honorius III, 168, 493–95, 505, 545, 568
Hope, 37, 42–43, 134, 136, 158, 161, 171, 223, 271, 277, 282–83, 287, 292, 299–300, 326, 334 n. 8, 404, 416, 430, 471 n. 95, 483, 486, 501–02, 535, 551, 575
Hugh of Saint Cher, 170–71, 183
Hugh of Saint Victor, 12, 41, 112, 118, 137, 167, 169, 184, 306, 312, 318, 335–37, 341, 372, 528–29
Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg, 57
Hughes, Kevin, 394, 396
Humbert of Romans, 438, 447–49, 457, 458 n. 32, 470, 552 n. 27, 570 n. 83
Humility, 26, 31 n. 64, 41, 44, 105–06, 144, 152, 160, 167, 174–75, 338, 340, 371, 384, 386–87, 389–90, 392, 401, 406, 411, 415, 420–21, 463–64, 472 nn. 102–03, 475, n. 115, 476–78, 483, 485, 496 n. 222, 503, 505, 515–17,519, 524–25, 537, 547, 564
Hymn, 45, 290

Illumination, 22, 35, 39, 50, 52–53, 55 n. 121, 104, 112, 139, 145–46, 149, 150 n. 93, 151–52, 163, 184, 227, 244, 257 n. 31,

309, 317, 371–72, 377 n. 64, 378–79, 382, 393, 401, 249, 431–33, 471 n. 95, 483–86, 488–90, 497–500, 502, 506–07, 535, 570
Illuminato, Brother, 498–500
Image, 30–31, 36, 36, 42, 177, 190–91, 203–05, 209, 218, 221–24, 231, 238, 234–44, 267, 299, 301, 372–77, 378, 382, 384 n. 90, 394, 403, 405, 413, 415, 420, 430, 437–38, 445, 450, 465, 471 n. 95, 484 n. 358, 490, 498 n. 235, 499, 516, 533, 540, 570
Imitation, 38, 223, 226, 255, 264, 279–80, 284, 387, 389, 413, 441, 453, 461 n. 46, 462–65, 486–87, 498, 501, 503, 505–07, 520, 531, 540, 572
Incarnate Word (Incarnation), 22, 24, 43–44, 92–93, 114 n. 146, 116 n. 154, 118, 131, 152, 198 n. 39, 224, 227, 238, 245 n. 220, 247–86, 336, 353–55, 357, 362, 374, 376–79, 385, 392, 395–98, 413, 415, 427, 430–31, 433, 531, 540
Innocent III, 39 n. 78, 168, 464, 469, 473, 488, 490, 492 n. 198, 493, 494 n. 215, 505, 544
Innocent IV, 15, 18, 407, 466 n. 69–70, 474, 492 n. 198, 536, 551–52, 571, 575
Inspired Word, 92–93, 286, 354, 357, 427, 430–31
Isabelle of Longchamp, 411, 576
Itinerarium mentis in Deum [*Itin.*] (Journey of the Mind into God), 32–34, 40, 57, 68, 81, 89, 92, 98–99, 113, 124, 153, 201, 208, 252, 284–85, 301, 327, 329, 363, 370–74, 377, 383, 385, 388, 397, 420, 440, 450, 502, 510, 535, 540, 567

Jerome of Ascoli, 574
Jerome, 12, 41–42, 132, 171, 184, 517
Joachim of Fiore, 16–19, 26, 30, 53, 328, 423, 430, 514, 550–51
Joachimism, 31, 237 n. 205, 423, 471, 549
John Chrysostom, 41, 183, 517, 520, 528
John Damascene, 12, 198
John of Parma, 26, 181, 329, 408, 446–47, 470–72, 509–10, 514, 540, 543, 551–52, 562, 565, 567, 569
John of Rochelle 11, 15, 170, 175, 406
John of St Giles, 15
John of St Paul, 469, 473
John Peckam, 20, 32
John the Baptist, 31, 471
John XXII, 527
Joy, 42, 113, 293, 301, 316, 415, 535
Julian of Speyer, 438, 450, 459 n. 35, 463 n. 55, 481–82, 493 n. 202, 494 n. 214, 504
Justice, 38, 135, 157, 264, 278–79, 302, 329, 334 n. 8, 338–41, 406, 419, 425–27, 473 n. 103, 488–89, 491, 520, 529

La Verna (Alverna), 33, 40, 124, 328–29, 444–45, 497, 566
Lady Poverty, 477
LaNave, Gregory, 361–62, 369–70, 384, 388
Language, 25–26, 34, 43–44, 56–57, 64, 96, 100, 197, 200, 203, 211, 233, 260, 265, 322, 373, 408, 425, 429
Lateran Council III, 167
Lateran Council IV, 49, 152, 469, 544
Law, 12 n. 6, 29, 44, 140, 154, 175, 222, 227, 259, 270–71, 310, 333, 335–37, 340–45, 347–50, 352–57, 425–29, 487 n. 166, 494, 495 n. 219, 519, 524, 526–27, 536–37, 541, 546, 557–58, 560, 563
Lectio divina, 127–28, 159, 443 n. 38, 459, 569
Legenda major sancti Francisci [*Leg. maj.*] (Major Life of Saint Francis), 27, 29–30, 70, 109, 284–85, 299–300, 328–29, 369–70, 388, 420, 453–507, 460, 570
Legenda minor sancti Francisci Leg. min.] (Minor Life of saint Francis), 9, 29, 70, 73, 435–51, 569–70
Leo of Assisi, Brother, 455 n. 14
Leo XIII, 59, 161
Leprosy, 298, 390, 392, 411, 449–50, 477, 493–94
Lignum vitae [*Lig. vit.*] (Tree of Life), 42–44, 69, 79
Literal Sense, 110–11, 115–16, 177–78, 184, 294, 357, 415–16, 426
Liturgy, 25, 44, 239, 283, 289–90, 292–93, 300, 315, 322, 410, 414, 418–22, 429, 433, 435–44, 346–48, 450, 453, 456–60, 462 n. 48, 465–66, 481, 489, 503–04, 563, 569–70
Logic, 62, 92–93, 125, 130, 149, 200, 214, 240, 363, 386, 388, 392, 398, 415, 429
Lohr, Charles, 127
Longpré, Ephrem, 32
Louis IX, 19, 44, 54, 411, 467, 574, 576

Manual labor, 468 n. 80, 475, 477, 517, 524, 537–38, 549, 551
Mariology, 48
Marion, Jean Luc, 368, 392
Mark of Montefaltro, 404
Mary and Martha, 421
Mary Magdalene, 417, 430, 432, 441
Mary, virgin (mother), 45, 48 n. 96, 269, 280 n. 133, 269, 298, 299, 324, 427, 537

Masseo, Brother, 299
Material Cause, 86, 89, 368
Matrimony (marriage), 249 n. 6, 292, 334 n. 8, 340 n. 33, 341–43, 345, 347–48, 352, 354–56
Matthew of Aquasparta, 56, 512
McGinn, Bernard, 56, 551
Mechanical arts, 82, 102, 138–39
Meditation (*meditatio*), 25, 33, 35–38, 41–45, 128, 159, 170, 182, 285, 302, 320, 413, 418–21, 426, 438, 475 n. 115
Medium, 93, 103, 151, 186, 243, 247, 250, 253–55, 257, 261, 267–68, 272, 284–86, 309, 341, 354, 376, 378, 386, 431
Memory, 43, 147, 204, 243, 299, 350, 374–75, 419, 434, 436, 438–41, 444, 450, 510, 560 n. 51
Mercy, 38, 259, 270, 324, 338–41, 440, 483, 493, 519–20, 539
Mercy seat (propitiatory), 285, 302, 379, 382
Merit, 156, 258, 260–61, 275–77, 302, 325–26, 336, 417, 461, 529–31, 536, 561
Miccoli, Giovanni, 510
Michael the Archangel, 289–90, 292, 297–301, 311, 323–24, 497 n. 228
Mirror (*speculum*), 44, 158, 176, 373–74, 377, 386, 479, 487, 531
Monaldo, Brother, 493 n. 204, 495, 501 n. 256
Moorman, John, 511
Moral, 12, 19, 21, 25, 116 n. 154, 138–40, 151, 153, 156, 158, 169, 193, 295, 297, 326, 431
Moses, 31 n. 64, 44, 53 n. 114, 174, 337, 343, 347, 427, 465 n. 67, 487 n. 152, 494–95, 499
Mother, 325, 332, 415, 425, 440, 464–65, 491 n. 191, 537
Mutability, 114, 161 n. 143
Mysticism, 27, 35, 39, 154, 301–02, 365, 399, 402, 450

Natural law, 140, 154, 270, 336–37, 340 n. 33, 342–43
Necessary reasons, 97, 116–17, 120, 145
Nicholas III, 527
Nicholas, St, 416–17
Novice, 30, 461, 568

Obedience, 38, 245 n. 220, 279–80, 297, 376, 439, 456, 465 n. 65, 472 nn. 99, 102, 473, 475 n. 115, 476, 485, 515, 518, 522, 531, 555
Octave, 29 n. 54, 435–36, 439, 442–45, 447–50, 455, 457–58, 460–61, 462 n. 48, 495 n. 216, 503–04, 570
Odo Rigaldi, 11, 90 n. 29, 94, 97
Ontological, 104, 147, 150–51, 222–23, 239, 321, 377, 381, 394, 397, 539
Ordinal, 438, 458, 469 n. 79
Ordinem vestrum, 536
Original sin, 144, 154, 156, 278, 306, 374, 516
Oudino, Casimiro, 64–65, 67, 72

Pacifico, Brother, 492, 495, 500 n. 249, 501 n. 256
Papias of Hierapolis, 430
Participation, 191, 244, 268, 319, 366, 387, 398, 531
Passion, 38, 88, 160, 258–61, 265, 277, 279, 281–82, 284–85, 301, 316–17, 324, 335, 353, 371, 385–86, 390, 418–19, 471 n. 95, 483, 486, 498
Paul (Apostle), 10, 38, 50, 53 n. 114, 133, 285, 294, 320, 367, 433, 503, 528, 532
Peace, 30, 34, 36, 38, 160, 163, 278, 285, 291, 238, 329, 405–06, 413, 429, 467 n. 70, 471 n. 95, 475, 492
Penance, 16, 334 n. 8, 342–45, 347–48, 352, 354–56, 392, 411, 469, 475, 487–88, 491, 544–45, 561, 563, 574
Pentecost, 282–83, 345–46, 347 n. 64, 356, 418, 427, 429, 552
Pentecost Chapter (1217), 492, 494 n. 214, 495
Per modum liberalitas, 207, 217
Per modum naturae, 199 n. 44, 207, 218–19, 242, 380
Per modum voluntatis, 199 n. 44, 217, 230, 233–34, 242
Per originem, 210–12
Peter (Apostle), 128, 433, 443, 477 n. 133
Peter Cantor, 167, 169, 403, 407, 432
Peter Comestor, 12, 167, 169
Peter John Olivi, 404, 512
Peter Lombard, 12–13, 50, 82, 96, 105, 121, 130–31, 170, 172, 249, 252 n. 12, 295, 306, 333, 335–36, 339, 342, 347, 357
Peter Tarentise, 12 n. 6, 573–74
Phantasm, 307, 310, 417
Physics, 138, 140, 149, 305
Piety, 101, 106, 117–18, 134, 293, 371, 389–90, 396, 406, 428, 446, 485, 524, 529
Pius V, 62
Plato, 50, 126, 130, 134, 236
Platonism, 50, 115, 125–26, 134, 153–54, 157, 160, 189–90, 194, 196–97, 202, 206, 218, 295–96, 303, 317, 374, 379
Plotinus, 190
Poor Clares, 39, 41, 411, 574–76

Portiuncula (Saint Mary of the Angels), 484 n. 158, 491–92
Portiuncula Chapter, 481
Postilla, 172, 179–86
Praise, 48, 105, 263, 277, 293, 300, 337, 373, 405, 413, 419, 429, 432, 456 n. 18, 461, 463–64, 468 n. 80, 489, 525, 529
Prayed Francis, 437–38, 440, 443, 445, 465
Pride, 158, 189, 230 n. 180, 280–81, 306, 366, 529, 568
Primacy (*primitas*), 201, 205 n. 61, 208–09, 212, 214–16, 231, 240–42, 245
Prophecy, 17–19, 30–31, 53, 270, 274, 327–28, 439, 463, 471 n. 95, 485, 490 n. 186, 497, 498 n. 231, 514–15, 551
Providence, 31, 51, 305, 317, 320, 488–89, 498, 520–21, 525, 538
Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, 12, 16, 35–36, 89, 153–54, 176 n. 40, 193–94, 196–98, 199 n. 45, 200, 206, 294, 296, 307, 319–21, 378–80, 382–83, 468 n. 81
Purgation, 37–39, 257 n. 31, 371, 401, 429, 471 n. 95, 483–86, 488, 497, 502, 506–07, 535
Purity, 37, 142, 160, 297, 324, 327, 524, 529

Quaestio disputata de mysterio Trinitatis [*Myst. Trin.*] (Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity), 22, 66, 68, 72, 91, 99, 101, 132
Quaestio disputata de perfectione evangelica [*Perf. evang.*] (Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection), 21, 78, 372, 472–73, 513, 515, 522
Quaestio disputata de scientia Christi [*Scien. Chr.*] (Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ), 21–22, 66, 68, 72, 98, 132, 146, 252
Quasi lignum vitae, 467, 474
Quo elongati, 523 n. 24, 536, 549

Rahner, Karl, 401
Raphael the Archangel, 301, 311, 323–24
Ratzinger, Joseph, 108, 110–11
Reductio, 89–90, 98, 100, 114–15, 117 n. 156, 136–37, 368, 400, 413, 431, 443 nn. 36–37, 539
Reform, 29, 42, 54, 58, 327, 424, 430, 447–48, 451, 453, 457–59, 465, 544–46, 555, 557, 573, 577
Regula novitiorum [*Reg. nov.*] (Rule for Novices), 56, 70, 440
Reportatio, 27, 46, 54, 414, 427, 563
Resolutio, 151, 205 n. 61, 209
Resurrection, 25, 45, 256, 258, 260, 282–83, 292, 344, 345, 347 n. 64, 349, 496 n. 222
Revelation, 23–24, 33, 51–53, 81, 83–85, 87–89, 92 n. 38, 93, 95 n. 51, 96, 101–02, 104, 106, 109–10, 112–14, 116, 118, 122–23, 136, 140–43, 154–56, 162, 173, 177–79, 203, 206, 215, 224, 227, 244, 275 n. 102, 296, 309, 318, 367, 370–71, 373, 379, 381, 386, 396–97, 400, 427, 489, 493–95, 497–989, 506 n. 273, 531
Richard of Saint Victor, 12, 34, 41, 112, 167, 189, 191–202, 206, 208, 210–11, 302, 379–80
Roger Bacon, 168, 171, 408, 423, 523
Ruh, Kurt, 56
Rule of Augustine, 533
Rule of Benedict, 297, 533
Rule of St Clare, 40, 575–76
Rule of St Francis, 407 n. 27, 409, 465, 469 n. 83, 473 n. 108, 475, 479, 481 n. 152, 482, 486, 488, 494–96, 504 n. 269, 505–06, 512, 523–24, 548–49, 554–55, 557–58, 559 n. 46, 561

Saints, 48, 111–12, 158–59, 173–74, 291–92, 297, 301, 305, 307, 312, 326, 362, 416–17, 425, 437, 462 n. 52, 493 n. 205, 520, 532
Salimbene de Adam, 181–82, 404, 408, 410, 461, 550, 559, 577
Satan (Devil, Lucifer), 158, 268 n. 70, 290–91, 305–06, 418–19, 425
Satisfaction, 107, 158–59, 264, 266–67, 272, 278, 280, 344
Sbaraglia, Giovanni, 58, 65, 67, 72
School of Chartres, 303
Secular-Mendicant controversy, 466, 474, 551 n. 24, 566
Seculars, 14–16, 21, 28, 171, 296–97, 327, 424, 466, 468–71, 472 nn. 99, 102, 474–76, 479–81, 504, 510, 513–16, 525–26, 546, 550–51, 554, 564–65, 571–72, 574
Self-expression, 92, 103, 218, 220–21, 223–24, 377, 395
Seminal reasons (*rationes seminales*), 56 n. 121, 115, 138, 248 n. 3
Senses of Scripture, 101, 115–16, 128, 178, 294, 416
Sermo Christus unus omnium magister [*Chr. mag.*] (Christ the One Teacher of All), 68, 77, 81, 142
Sermones [Serm.] (Sermons), 23, 71, 77, 410–21, 440
Siger of Brabant, 422

Similitude (likeness), 34, 36, 92, 115, 137, 147, 151, 203–04, 217–18, 221–26, 237, 243–44, 335 n. 12, 373, 375, 378, 415, 438, 464, 496 n. 222, 497–99, 516, 540
Simony, 468
Simplicity, 22, 28, 132, 208–09, 308, 312, 400, 428, 464 n. 63, 478, 541
Sixtus IV, 54, 61
Sixtus V, 62
Soliloquium de quatuor mentalibus exercitiis [Solil.] (Soliloquy), 41–42, 44, 69, 292, 326, 450
Solitude, 33, 489, 497
Speculation, 33–34, 74, 81, 99–101, 103, 109, 128, 130, 152, 189–91, 196 n. 31, 202, 296, 298, 303, 312, 318, 322, 327–28, 331, 366–67, 369–71, 384 n. 90, 385, 399–401, 432, 523, 540
Spirit, Holy, 14 n. 13, 30–31, 44, 87, 97, 100 n. 74, 101, 106, 115 n. 150, 134, 155, 175–79, 182, 189, 193, 213, 219, 228, 233–36, 237 n. 205, 251, 268 n. 70, 269 n. 72, 274, 331, 337, 342, 345–48, 356, 366–70, 379, 381–82, 384–86, 401, 416–17, 423–24, 427–28, 431, 471 n. 98, 514, 521
Spiritual men (*viri spirituales*), 109, 420–21, 430, 444, 471, 472 n. 102, 490–91, 493 n. 205, 502, 514, 522, 526, 550–51
Spirituality, 34, 40, 45, 56–58, 100 n. 73, 202, 250 n. 9, 307, 327, 361–402, 424, 515
Spouse, 38–39, 371, 378–79, 387
Spurious works (Bonaventure), 65, 68–74, 78–80, 505 n. 269
Stephen Langton, 167, 169, 171, 306
Stigmata, 31, 33, 109, 284–85, 290 n. 2, 298, 329, 363, 372, 388–89, 401, 436, 439–41, 444–45, 450, 463, 473, 475 n/ 115, 485–87, 495–503, 506
Stohr, Albert, 2, 194
Stoicism, 160, 316–17
Subalternation, 94–95, 106, 119, 362, 365
Synecdoche, 425

Tavard, George, 116 n. 154, 118
Thomas Aquinas, 16, 19, 24, 47, 52, 55, 58, 62, 64, 90, 119–20, 200, 367, 406, 513, 515, 526
Thomas of Celano, 420, 438, 457, 463 n. 55, 471 n. 94, 473 n. 106, 478 n. 137, 480–81, 494 n. 214, 503–04, 569
Thomas of Eccleston, 408
Thomas of Spalato, 405
Thomas of York, 48, 515, 526–27
Threefold Word, 93 n. 38, 250 n. 8, 286
Transitus, 33–34, 108, 416, 487, 502
Triple Way (*triplex via*), 34–35, 40, 56, 257 n. 31, 463, 471 n. 95, 483–88, 496–97, 500, 506
Tropological Sense, 169, 177, 416

Ubertino of Casale, 43, 504 n. 269, 512
Unbegotten (*innascibilitas*), 212–16, 224, 231, 245, 380
Uncreated Word, 92–93, 114 n. 146, 221, 262, 282, 286, 354, 357, 377–78, 430–31, 531
Urban IV, 480, 571, 576
Urs von Balthasar, Hans, 361–62, 389
Usus pauper, 476, 492, 504 n. 269

van Steenberghen, Ferdinand, 103, 143, 153
Vestige of God, 203, 243–44, 372–73, 382, 516
Vice, 37, 94 n. 45, 158, 407, 516, 534–35
Viri ecclesiastici, 429, 431–32
Virtue, 13, 25, 37, 41, 55, 56 n. 121, 94, 94 n. 45, 101, 106–07, 109, 114–15–17, 134, 136, 140–41, 147, 154, 160, 256, 260, 264, 266–67, 271–72, 274, 276, 278–79, 283, 297, 309, 321–22, 324, 329–31, 334, 353–55, 419–20, 429, 431, 434, 436, 439, 441, 443, 461, 471 n. 95, 484, 486, 491, 496, 499 n. 241, 500–02, 506, 516–17, 519–21, 524, 530–31, 533–35, 538, 556, 570
Vulgate, 142, 171, 300, 325

Wadding, Luke, 64, 523, 567
Way of life, 16, 21, 48–49, 409, 475 n. 115, 492 n. 198, 523, 525, 538, 544, 546–48, 558, 564, 570
William de la Mare, 171
William of Altona, 185
William of Auvergne, 13, 194
William of Auxerre, 93, 109, 194
William of Melitona, 11, 15–16, 41
William of Saint-Amour, 16, 18–19, 47, 466–72, 505, 515, 519, 521–22, 526–27, 551–53, 572
Wisdom (*sapientia*), 14, 22, 34, 38, 50, 52, 61, 63, 88 n. 24, 98–101, 103, 104 n. 86, 106, 108, 110, 115, 116 n. 153, 119, 122–24, 128–29, 133–37, 139–40, 142, 144, 154, 157–63, 173, 175–77, 183, 185, 192, 203, 239–40, 247, 258260, 262–63, 264 n. 53, 268, 271, 273, 275–77, 279–81, 286–87, 296, 322, 335, 337–40, 350, 361–62, 366, 369–71, 373–74, 383, 385–89, 392–93, 395–96, 399–401, 406, 417, 428–30,

473, 478, 496 n. 222, 502–03, 512, 520, 531, 539
Woman, 53, 268 n. 70, 269, 311, 341 n. 35, 401, 464, 465 n. 63, 468, 519, 526, 562 n. 58
Word of God, 24, 39, 44, 51, 92, 103, 121, 127, 136, 151, 174–75, 177, 189, 204, 217–18, 220–22, 225–27, 239, 242, 247–51, 253, 255–59, 261, 264–69, 271–75, 277, 281–84, 286, 336, 342, 353–55, 362, 373–77, 379, 381–82, 385–86, 391, 394–98, 416, 427, 430, 432, 488, 525, 530–31, 540, 545, 548
Worship, 134, 272–73, 293, 300, 302, 351, 425–26, 436, 441, 569, 577